



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019

No. 4

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. KELLY of Illinois).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 9, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBIN L. KELLY 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.

IMPEACHMENT IS NOT DEAD

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. I rise, Madam Speaker, on behalf of Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution.

I rise, Madam Speaker, on behalf of the more than 40 percent of people in this country who believe that an unfit President ought to be impeached. I rise on behalf of the many people who believe that somehow the voices of those who favor impeachment have been muted.

And I want you to know, Madam Speaker, and to those who are listening, I want you to know that there is at least one person in the Congress of the United States of America who believes that an unfit President ought to be impeached.

I rise on behalf of those, Madam Speaker, who believe that if President Barack Obama had behaved the way the current President has behaved, he would have been impeached. I rise to take a stand on behalf of the many who believe in impeachment of an unfit President. More than 40 percent of this country believes it. More than 80 percent, thereabout, of Democrats believe it.

And I rise on behalf of the many people who understand that there is a humanitarian crisis at the border, the many people who believe that babies ought not be confined in small, confined places where they have to trip over each other if they want to traverse from one side of the room to the other. These are babies. I rise on behalf of these babies.

And I rise on behalf of the many people who believe that if these babies were White babies, the response would be vastly different. We know that we would not tolerate what is happening in this humanitarian crisis if these were not people of color. We wouldn't tolerate it if they were White. We ought to treat all babies the same. We know that this President is a bigot, and we know that this policy at the border is rooted in bigotry.

Madam Speaker, I want you to know that this will not be my last time standing in the well of the Congress to deal with this issue. Let others do what they may; take on the issues that you choose; but know that I believe an unfit President ought to be impeached, and we ought not have a double standard such that we treat people of color differently from the way we treat people not of color. And that is what is happening right now at this border.

If they were coming in from the north and they were White, the reaction wouldn't be the same. The fervor would be greater. The demand for justice would be greater.

We have to take a stand against bigotry. We cannot allow it to continue to grow in this country. We are the place where the President is to be brought before the bar of justice. Only the House of Representatives can do it.

And I declare this day that impeachment is not dead.

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

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 103RD PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, over the weekend, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania kicked off one of my favorite events, the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

For more than a century, farmers have gathered each January at the Pennsylvania Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. 102 years ago, the very first Pennsylvania Farm Show was held on January 23 through January 25, 1917, under the title of the Pennsylvania Corn, Fruit, Vegetable, Dairy Products, and Wool Show.

In 1955, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Penn State University president at the time and the brother of the then-President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, dubbed the Pennsylvania Farm Show "always the greatest show on Earth."

Thanks to the dedication of the Pennsylvania farmers and farm families, tens of thousands of volunteers, and generations of agribusiness owners

□ 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.

H291

and staff from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, the Pennsylvania Farm Show continues to be among the greatest shows on Earth.

This weeklong event is the largest indoor agricultural exposition in the Nation, showcasing over 6,000 animals, featuring nearly 12,000 exhibits and more than half a million visitors.

Each year, I host a listening session at the Farm Show, and we covered a range of topics on Saturday during the public forum, from raising awareness about agriculture education to helping our dairy farmers, and more. We discussed the passage of the 2018 farm bill, which will restore certainty for our farm families, provide nutritional support and greater opportunity for ultimate food security through employment for our neighbors in financial need, renew a pathway to prosperity for our dairy producers, and build toward a stronger rural economy.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture, Russell Redding, for participating in the listening session, and also my colleagues: Congressman DWIGHT EVANS, Congressman DAN MEUSER, and Congressman LLOYD SMUCKER.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show truly does bring together so many different people in the ag community, and it is an event like no other.

The Farm Show complex houses 24 acres under one roof, spread throughout 11 buildings, including three arenas. There is no admission fee. It is a great event for the entire family, and there are numerous educational shows.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show provides an atmosphere for everyone to walk through, observe, and educate themselves about the different areas of agriculture, the Commonwealth's largest industry, which brings nearly \$6.9 billion annually in agricultural cash receipts. Almost half a million jobs are tied to the industry, which positively impacts all Pennsylvanians.

Madam Speaker, 103 years ago, the Pennsylvania Farm Show was a 3-day exhibit. Today, the event is a weeklong celebration of how the agriculture industry touches our lives every day. Proudly, this event draws visitors from across the country to highlight everything our State has to offer when it comes to ag. Numerous students participate in the event as well from 4-H clubs to FFA organizations.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show truly showcases our Nation's farmers and landowners. I was thrilled to again take part in the best agricultural expo in the country.

Madam Speaker, I want to close with the words from the prologue to the 100th anniversary book that is published by the Farm Show Foundation, with the Farm Show being dedicated to the farmers who feed us, the Penn State extension staff that lead us, and the consumers that need us.

OPEN OUR GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. CARBAJAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, this week, I visited the Customs and Border Protection facilities where 8-year-old Felipe Gomez Alonso was held shortly before he fell sick and tragically died on Christmas Eve. This was just 3 weeks after 7-year-old Jakelyn Caal died in custody nearby.

I went to Alamogordo because I wanted to hear directly from CBP agents why these two children died and what changes are being made to ensure that not one more child dies while in United States custody.

CBP agents told us that they needed more personnel, more technological support, better coordination between agencies, and improvements to facilities to accommodate the higher percentage of children and families seeking asylum.

One checkpoint I visited didn't have a shower for migrants. They were transported an hour each way every 2 days for a shower. The other facility didn't even have potable water.

The Border Patrol agents were also understandably frustrated that their online database did not synchronize with DHS systems, creating even more confusion when migrants were being moved or processed. Not once did the agents mention building a wall.

What I confirmed was that this President purposefully created this humanitarian crisis at the border for political reasons by taking the following actions:

Trump cut the Central American Minors refugee program, which had allowed migrants from Central America to apply for humanitarian relief while in their home countries instead of traveling to our border, forcing them to make a dangerous journey with their children to escape life-threatening violence in their countries.

He then separated families at the border, taking toddlers from the arms of parents and losing track of people's children in the process, a stain on the history of our great Nation.

And he blocked asylum-seekers from their legal right to present themselves for screenings through metering at the ports or denying all asylum claims, creating huge backlogs at the legal ports of entry with squalid conditions and pushing more migrants to attempt to cross the border between ports of entry out of desperation.

This is a real humanitarian crisis that is unfolding because of the President's obsession with an ineffective wall that Mexico was supposedly going to pay for rather than listening to the actual needs of our CBP officers.

The President continues to repeat the lie, as he did last night again, that America faces a crisis in the number of border crossings from Mexico. Surprisingly, there was not one migrant housed at the two CBP facilities I visited this week.

The reality is that overall border crossings are on the decline. There has

been an 80 percent reduction in the number of border crossings since the year 2000.

Trump created and welcomed this shutdown, telling the public that he is proud to shut down the government and that he "will take the mantle of shutting it down." The President should, instead, join Congress and immediately sign bipartisan legislation that previously passed both the House and the Senate to reopen the government.

More than 800,000 Federal workers aren't sure of when their next paycheck is coming, airport security and safety is suffering, and the affordable housing programs for our homeless veterans are quickly running out of funding on the central coast that I represent and across the Nation. I urge the President to do the right thing so that we can get to work for the American people.

Mr. President, open our government up.

CONGRATULATING CLEMSON TIGERS ON WINNING 2019 NATIONAL FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today because it is a great day, a great week, and a great year to be a Clemson Tiger.

The Third District of South Carolina, which I represent, is home to the Clemson Tigers, who were victorious in their performance against the Alabama Crimson Tide on Monday to claim their third college football national championship, resulting in a perfect season, the first 15-win season in the modern era of Division I football.

Coach Dabo Swinney led this historic team to not only victory, but a dominating performance to truly establish Clemson as the best college football team in the entire country. They left no room for doubt. It was an amazing performance for everyone, from quarterback Trevor Lawrence—and my friend from Georgia, BARRY LOUDERMILK, will talk about Trevor shortly, the first true freshman to start and win a national championship in 33 years—to seniors like Christian Wilkins and walk-on wide receiver Hunter Renfrow.

□ 1015

The entire team and coaching staff showed poise, control, and leadership on and off the field the entire night.

Coach Brent Venables, the defensive coordinator, prepared the Clemson defense well. Alabama was in the red zone three times, on three different occasions, but came away with zero points due to the great Tiger defense standing strong. Great work, Coach Venables, and a great job, Clemson defense.

The Tide threw two interceptions in the first half, which Clemson leveraged

to turn into points for the Tigers, establishing more dominance in the game.

The Clemson offense scored an incredible 44 points over Alabama's 16; 31 of those points were unanswered, to the shock of many in the college football world, but not a shock to the Tiger nation. We know what this Dabo Swinney-coached team was capable of.

At the end of the night, Clemson's near-perfect game was too much for Alabama. The performance was truly remarkable to see, as the whole Nation stopped to watch the two top programs in college football duke it out and leave their hearts on the field.

The Clemson senior class is one to be remembered; four straight ACC championships, two national championships, and 55 wins over the last 4 years.

Madam Speaker, to say I am a proud alumnus and former walk-on Clemson football player would be an understatement.

Above all else, one of the things I am most impressed with is Coach Dabo Swinney's leadership and character. He is truly a bright light in the realm of college football. Like Dabo has said many times: "Let the light that shines in you be brighter than the light that shines on you."

Of course, Dabo cares about playing amazing football. He has proven this over and over again in a fantastic 10 years as the head coach. He is now one of two active college football coaches with a national championship under the belt, right along with Alabama's Nick Saban.

But I know Dabo cares about something more, something bigger and more important than football. He cares about the hearts and souls of his players. He cares about their character, their leadership skills, and their aspirations well after they leave the field.

He cares about the types of men these players will become as friends, brothers, sons, future husbands, and fathers. He invests in them to train them as both elite athletes and elite people.

There is only one reason for this type of compassion. He strives to mirror Jesus Christ's unconditional love for us every day as a leader, a coach, a husband, a father, and a friend. And as he said after the game: "Only God can do this." How true this is in all areas of our lives.

Coach Swinney never misses an opportunity to speak the truth on the platform God has given him to proclaim the amazing, Christlike love that is bestowed upon all of us. You can tell he always wants to be that type of example.

I believe this is what makes Clemson so special, a leader who prays with his staff and his players; a leader who shows Christlike love to everyone that he meets; a leader who prioritizes character over everything else; a leader who cares about you as a person, not just a football player. We can learn a lot from Dabo.

Thanks, Coach, for being the man that you are.

Hats off to Alabama who always has a storied and successful program. The competition on Monday night captured the entire Nation's attention through that battle between two amazing football programs. It was a great game, and Coach Nick Saban and his Alabama team are remarkable. This team was remarkable.

But, hey, in a college sporting event, somebody has got to lose, and I am glad my Clemson Tigers were able to win on Monday night.

Clemson's success wasn't built overnight. This was built by years of focus, work, and grind, paid for with blood, sweat, and tears on the field, in the weight room, in the film room, and everywhere in between. Nothing great ever comes easy.

So, Madam Speaker, as a former player, a proud Clemson graduate, a lifetime Tiger, I am filled with pride to see where this Clemson program is today, how it has elevated the university and the entire State.

People in this Chamber and on Capitol Hill, Members of Congress, Capitol Hill police, the staff, they may not know my name, but they know who the Clemson fan is amongst them.

Many of my Alabama colleagues, like Mo Brooks, were texting me during the game. I can't reveal what those texts said, but I appreciate the time.

Clemson is a special place with proud alumni all over the world. There is something in the hills where the Blue Ridge yawns its greatness, and the football team showed this greatness Monday night.

I am immensely proud of Coach Swinney, the players, and the administration, and I will always be all in.

Go Tigers, the college football national champions. Congratulations once again.

AMTRAK CLOSURE IN RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because nearly 500 Amtrak workers in Riverside are being forced to uproot their lives or lose everything they worked so hard for, a good, stable union job that pays them well and gives them benefits.

This nightmare scenario is born out of a sudden decision by Amtrak to shutter its call center in Riverside in what amounts to a union-busting maneuver to outsource jobs and replace these employees with contractors for lower pay.

Today, I want the Amtrak CEO to hear, not from me, but from Theresa Kolaras, an Amtrak employee in Riverside, and U.S. Army veteran, who will be losing her job on January 18 if Amtrak moves forward with this call center closure. And here is what Theresa had to say:

Growing up, it was my dream to serve my country. That's why I joined the JROTC pro-

gram in high school. And after 9/11, I enlisted with the U.S. Army with hopes of making a difference and happy to have a career. My job wasn't glamorous. I was a Unit Support Specialist, MOS 92 Yankee. But I was proud to be serving during a difficult time for our country.

Unfortunately, just as my platoon was readying to deploy, I suffered successive fractures in my foot that wouldn't heal. I was honorably discharged due to the injury and, just like that, my dreams were cut short. At the time, nothing saddened me more than having to watch my friends deploy without me.

Saddled with my foot that wouldn't heal, I now had to figure out what to do with my life. Jobs were hard to find due to having to choose ones that kept me off my feet so much. I found many odd jobs here and there and, within a few years, I finally started a family and continued my education.

In 2014, I was ecstatic to find out I was hired with Amtrak, as I come from a railroad family, and was proud to continue that tradition. Being able to work at our call center in Riverside was a blessing for my family and me.

Amtrak's reputation for its passengers and its employees gave me hope for a brighter future. Living in California is nearly impossible, with its high cost of living, especially being a single mother of two boys.

I was able to take care of my kids on the great benefits and wages at Amtrak. My boys love the train and enjoy our many trips we were able to take.

Now, on November 14, I got a sudden awakening as I got notice that Amtrak would be closing our call center in Riverside.

Amtrak reassured us employees our jobs were secure. As months went by, Amtrak started closing stations, putting employees out of work, and many of us in Riverside started to worry about our jobs.

Now that feeling of worry is a reality, and we're left wondering why Amtrak has been so dishonest.

Amtrak sent out a letter to us stating that they are not laying us off, but we are able to go to its Philadelphia call center.

Now, I count myself among the great majority that just can't pick up on short notice and leave. I have small children and share custody, and I can't legally move my kids out of state.

I honestly have no idea where my children and I will go. We have a month to figure out where to live, as I can't pay rent without a job, along with this injury that I still deal with every day.

I am one of the many employees who are at a hardship, and a few days away from closing we still don't have any real answers or hope that we will at least have a severance package.

Amtrak has been quiet, and I am still in disbelief that this was once a company that was known for its employee and customer loyalty. Many of us loved our jobs because we were proud of the railroad, proud to wear the name, and proud to help our customers plan their trips.

Now, at work these last few days, I see people with despair in their faces and loss of hope in their eyes.

I still have hope that Amtrak will wake up and realize that the direction they are going is hurting its customers and its employees, which are their biggest fans. This decision is both ethically and morally wrong.

I would like to thank Theresa for allowing me to read her powerful statement to Amtrak's CEO.

As of today, 39 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, and I, as well as Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator HARRIS,

have joined the Amtrak workers in this fight. We will do everything we can do to fight this closure until the bitter end.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S IMMIGRATION LETTER TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on January 4, 2019, President Trump sent Congress a letter about America's border crisis. That letter states, in part: "It is the sovereign right of every nation to establish an immigration program in its national interest, lawfully admitting those who have followed the rules, while denying entry to those who break the rules or fail to meet the requirements established in law.

"A nation that fails to control its borders cannot fulfill its most basic obligations to its citizens, physical safety, economic security, essential public services, and the uniform protection of our laws. . . . The southern border is a very dangerous place; in fact, Border Patrol agents routinely encounter some of the most dangerous criminals, cartels, and traffickers anywhere in the world.

"Effective border security must dramatically reduce the entry of illegal immigrants, criminals, and drugs; it must keep out terrorists, public safety threats, and those otherwise inadmissible under U.S. law; and it must ensure that those who do enter without legal permission can be promptly and safely returned home. . . . current funding levels, resources, and authorities are woefully inadequate to meet the scope of the problem. We are no longer in a status quo situation at the southern border, but in a crisis situation. Status quo funding is not enough.

"In fiscal year 2018, 17,000 adults at the border with existing criminal records were arrested by Customs and Border Protection and border agents.

"In FY 2017 and FY 2018, ICE officers arrested approximately 235,000 aliens on various criminal charges or convictions within the interior of the United States, including roughly 100,000 for assault, 30,000 for sex crimes, and 4,000 for homicides."

For emphasis, over the past 2 years, illegal aliens have averaged 50,000 physical assaults, 15,000 sex crimes, and 2,000 killings per year, all in America.

Returning to President Trump's letter: "300 Americans are killed every week from heroin, 90 percent of which floods across our southern border."

Stated differently, our porous southern border and illegal aliens contribute to the deaths of another 15,000 Americans per year from just one drug, heroin. According to the Centers for Disease Control, there are another 55,000 dead Americans from overdoses from other poisonous drugs, many of which, like heroin, steal across our porous southern border.

President Trump continues in his letter:

"Illegal immigration is not progressive. By every measure it is unfair, unjust, uncompassionate, and cruel. Many people are killed. It hurts both those who make the journey and so many communities bearing the cost in lives, safety, and dollars. . . . Absolutely critical to border security and national security is a wall or a physical barrier that prevents entry in the first place. Members of both parties—including then-Senators Obama and Clinton, current Senator SCHUMER, and many other Members of the House and Senate—all voted for a hard physical barrier. Walls work. That's why rich, powerful, and successful people build them around their homes. All Americans deserve the same protection. In Israel, it is 99 percent effective."

Madam Speaker, open borders advocates forced Washington to either shut down the government or do nothing, nothing to prevent the deaths of thousands of Americans each year that result from our porous southern border and illegal alien criminal activity. This is a bad choice.

To the contrary, we should both end the government shutdown and secure our borders by building a wall and changing our immigration laws to protect the lives of American men, women, and children.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD President Trump's letter to Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 4, 2019.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Congratulations to Speaker Nancy Pelosi, and her entire team, on her election to be Speaker of the House. I look forward to working together on our shared priorities for the American People, including rebuilding our infrastructure, reforming unfair trade deals, and reducing the price of prescription drugs. Our recent bipartisan success on numerous legislative accomplishments such as Criminal Justice Reform, opioid legislation, and the Farm Bill, underscores the extraordinary achievements that are possible when we rise above party politics to advance the good of the Nation as a whole.

As we begin this new Congress, our first task should be to reopen the Government and to deliver on our highest duty as elected officials: the security of the Nation and its borders.

It is the sovereign right of every nation to establish an immigration program in its national interest—lawfully admitting those who have followed the rules, while denying entry to those who break the rules or fail to meet the requirements established in law.

A nation that fails to control its borders cannot fulfill its most basic obligations to its citizens—physical safety, economic security, essential public services, and the uniform protection of our laws.

I was grateful for the opportunity to meet with Congressional leadership at the White House this Wednesday to discuss the border security crisis, and the need for a government funding bill that secures the border and keeps Americans safe.

During the meeting, there was debate over the nature and extent of this crisis and its impact on Americans. It had been my hope that Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen would have the opportunity to de-

liver a presentation discussing the facts about the depth and severity of the humanitarian crisis and the security crisis that is now unfolding at the Southern Border.

However, some of those present did not want to hear the presentation at the time, and so I have instead decided to make the presentation available to all Members of Congress. I encourage you to review it carefully, to share it with your staff, and to discuss it with other lawmakers. In crafting a Homeland Security bill, it is essential that we make decisions based upon the facts on the ground—not ideology and rhetoric—and that we listen to the law enforcement personnel on the front lines. The Southern Border is a very dangerous place—in fact, Border Patrol agents routinely encounter some of the most dangerous criminals, cartels, and traffickers anywhere in the world.

Effective border security must dramatically reduce the entry of illegal immigrants, criminals, and drugs; it must keep out terrorists, public safety threats, and those otherwise inadmissible under U.S. law; and it must ensure that those who do enter without legal permission can be promptly and safely returned home.

As the enclosed presentation makes clear, current funding levels, resources, and authorities are woefully inadequate to meet the scope of the problem. We are no longer in a status quo situation at the Southern Border but in a crisis situation. Status quo funding is not enough.

In fiscal year (FY) 2018, 17,000 adults at the border with existing criminal records were arrested by Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and border agents.

In FY2017 and FY2018, ICE officers arrested approximately 235,000 aliens on various criminal charges or convictions within the interior of the United States—including roughly 100,000 for assault, 30,000 for sex crimes, and 4,000 for homicides.

We are now averaging 60,000 illegal and inadmissible aliens a month on our Southern Border.

Last month alone, more than 20,000 minors were smuggled into the United States.

The immigration court backlog is nearly 800,000 cases.

There has been a 2,000 percent increase in asylum claims over the last five years, with the largest growth coming from Central America—while around 9 in 10 claims from Central American migrants are ultimately rejected by the immigration courts, the applicant has long since been released into the interior of the United States.

In FY2017, roughly 135,000 illegal and inadmissible family units arrived from Central America. Of those, less than 2 percent have been successfully removed from the country due to a shortage of resources and glaring loopholes in our federal laws.

So far in FY2019, we have seen a 280 percent increase in family units from FY2018.

300 Americans are killed every week from heroin—90 percent of which floods across our Southern Border.

Illegal immigration is a humanitarian crisis: 1 in 3 migrant women is sexually assaulted on the journey northward to the U.S. border; 50 illegal migrants a day are referred for emergency medical care; and CBP rescues 4,300 people a year who are in danger and distress.

Illegal immigration is NOT progressive—by every measure, it is unfair, unjust, uncompassionate, and cruel. Many people are killed. It hurts both those who make the journey and so many communities bearing the cost in lives, safety, and dollars.

Senator Chuck Schumer once said: "Illegal immigration is wrong, plain and simple. Until the American people are convinced that we will stop future flows of illegal immigration, we will make no progress on dealing with the millions of illegal immigrants

who are here now, and on rationalizing our system of legal immigration. That's plain and simple and unavoidable."

Absolutely critical to border security and national security is a wall or a physical barrier that prevents entry in the first place. Members of both parties—including then Senators Obama and Clinton, current Senator Schumer, and many other members of the House and Senate—all voted for a hard, physical barrier. Walls work. That's why rich, powerful, and successful people build them around their homes. All Americans deserve the same protection. In Israel, it is 99 percent effective.

We must also close the legal gaps in America's defenses. Loopholes in federal law that prevent removals provide a magnet for illegal entry, and a lucrative business model for vicious coyotes, while overwhelming the U.S. immigration system. The worst loopholes incentivize the smuggling of minors. Under these legal loopholes, if an illegal minor, or those traveling with a minor, merely set foot on United States soil, they cannot be successfully returned home. This explains the profound increases in the arrival of minors travelling both alone and with adults on the dangerous journey to our border.

To protect these children from abuse, and stop this illegal flow, we must close these loopholes. This is an urgent humanitarian necessity. Children are terribly used by criminals and coyotes to gain access to our country—they are the biggest victims of all.

The most pressing legal changes are as follows:

Terminate the Flores Settlement Agreement—which is preventing families from being held together through removal; and

Amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA), to allow for the safe and humane return of illegally-smuggled minors back to their families in their home countries.

Americans have endured decades of broken promises on illegal immigration. Now, is the time for both parties to rise above the partisan discord, to set aside political convenience, and to put the national interest first. Now is the time—this is the moment—to finally secure the border and create the lawful and safe immigration system Americans, and those wanting to become Americans, deserve.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. TRUMP.

□ 1030

TRUMP'S GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the impact of Donald Trump's government shutdown.

Today marks the 19th day that the United States has been in a partial government shutdown. How did we get here?

Let's be clear: This government shutdown is not about a border wall.

Our country is in the midst of a government shutdown because a man who has fashioned himself after a banana republic dictator, a con man engaging in the proverbial bait and switch, has decided to pickpocket the American people for an immoral border wall policy that the American people do not support.

This billionaire bully is intentionally imposing pain, anguish, and anxiety on 800,000 Federal workers, including over 14,000 New Yorkers, holding them and their families hostage in order to extort billions of dollars from the American taxpayer to satisfy a broken promise to his supporters that Mexico would pay for his wall. Meanwhile, real lives are at stake and hang in the balance.

On Friday, our Federal workers will face a clear uncertainty without a paycheck. Families are struggling to pay for their basic needs, their mortgages and rent, groceries, life-sustaining medications, and more due to this cruel, vindictive, and senseless shutdown.

Due to this absurd, mean-spirited government shutdown, many hard-working Americans will not receive their tax refunds in a timely manner, because the Department of the Treasury and IRS are closed.

Due to this irrational government shutdown, many families that rely on SNAP will struggle to put food on their tables.

Due to this malicious government shutdown, Federal contractors and their employees may never recover from the loss of their investments in doing the business of service to our Nation, their employees facing an economic crisis that could lead to unemployment, all because Donald Trump is running for reelection and he has no regard for the very people that he swore to protect and defend.

Our national parks and monuments are consumed by trash.

Our Transportation Safety Administration is stretched, with personnel on the job unable to afford their meals or the cost of travel to our Nation's airports to report for duty.

This reckless shutdown has placed us all in harm's way by impeding the mission of the EPA, lacking the requisite personnel to complete critical activities that protect the public health and environment.

Due to this pointless government shutdown, thousands of hardworking Americans all over this country residing in government-funded or subsidized properties risk eviction from their homes.

On our first day in the 116th Congress, House Democrats immediately got to work by introducing and passing a complete funding package to reopen the government for the people. House Democrats passed legislation that honors our responsibility to keep Americans safe while securing our borders.

Let's be clear: Democrats want sensible border security. Democrats want commonsense immigration reform.

So why is the United States in a government shutdown?

We can all recall that, while on the campaign trail, the current occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue promised the American people that a border wall is the solution for border security and that Mexico would pay for the wall.

However, the American people can see the immorality of this and did not like his policy of family separation at the border, and the Mexican President said, no, he would not pay for the wall.

Now, to feed his obsession to keep his ill-advised campaign promise, he is threatening to keep the government shut down for years.

Agent 45 is happy to keep hard-working Federal workers from being paid for years over an ineffective, immoral, and expensive border wall.

Trump's government shutdown keeps 420,000 Federal employees, including FBI agents, Customs and Border Protection agents, and Forest Service firefighters, working without pay.

Trump's government shutdown caused 400,000 Federal employees from the Department of Transportation, the Department of Commerce, and NASA to be furloughed, plunging their families into complete uncertainty.

Instead of funding a \$5 billion wall, let's talk about how we can invest in real priorities for the people.

With \$30.5 million, case management for immigrant families could expand to 25,000 families annually.

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

RECOGNIZING TREVOR LAWRENCE

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, on any given morning, except for Sundays, the Chick-fil-A in my hometown of Cartersville, Georgia, is buzzing with activity. In the past few years, among its host of customers, a young man could often be found at a corner table, watching videos of high school football games on his laptop.

That young man, Trevor Lawrence, was the quarterback for the Cartersville High School football team who led the Purple Hurricanes to two State championships and, along the way, broke Georgia State high school records for passing yards and touchdowns.

Today, that young man, who often retreated to Chick-fil-A to prepare for Friday night football, has been catapulted from a hometown star to a national football phenomenon.

Monday night, the Nation witnessed this young man, who just a year ago was playing high school football at Weinman Stadium in Cartersville, Georgia, lead the Clemson Tigers to a national championship.

The strength of Trevor Lawrence isn't just his playing ability, although he is truly talented; neither is it his size, strength, or his athleticism. Trevor's strength is his faith and strong character, which has been shaped by his family and a community that still promotes the values of integrity, community service, patriotism, and good morals.

Quick to give God the glory and praise to his teammates, Trevor's humility speaks louder than his long list of athletic accomplishments. In a recent interview, Trevor said: "Football is important to me, obviously, but it is not . . . the biggest thing in my life. I would say my faith is."

From billboards along Joe Frank Harris Parkway, to the marquis outside the Cartersville Chick-fil-A, our community is expressing pride in their hometown football star, not only for what he has accomplished, but more so for who he is.

On behalf of the people of Georgia's 11th Congressional District, I congratulate Trevor Lawrence on his exceptional performance in the NCAA National Championship game, and I commend his parents for instilling in him a strong set of values and the encouragement and motivation to work hard to achieve success.

I applaud the Cartersville High School coach, Joey King, for recognizing Trevor's potential and helping to develop this champion of the gridiron.

I also congratulate the Clemson Tigers and head coach Dabo Swinney on an exceptional season and a well-earned national championship.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH AMERICA'S TEACHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of millions of our Nation's teachers who fight for our children's future every single day.

Last year, tens of thousands of educators from Arizona helped lead the Nation, walking out of their classrooms to protest cuts to schools and funding. They told me about outdated textbooks, overcrowded classrooms, and school supplies so limited that kids were taking tests with crayons.

They succeeded in securing much-needed pay raises for teachers. But the Arizona Legislature refused to provide sufficient money for support staff, classroom supplies, and other resources they need to effectively do their jobs. So, today, Arizona teachers and I are wearing red, because the fight to ensure that every child receives a quality education is not over.

Our students deserve better. They deserve fully funded schools with state-of-the-art classrooms to ensure our kids have the skills they need to succeed in a quickly changing world. They deserve the challenges and opportunities that come from taking advanced placement classes that promote academic achievement and extracurricular activities to stimulate creativity and a passion for lifelong learning. They deserve teachers, aides, administrative staff, and bus drivers who are paid a fair and living wage.

Instead, the State continues to short-change our children by asking educators to do more with less.

Madam Speaker, I know firsthand the importance of properly funding the public school system. I am a product of it. I would not have the honor to stand here today and advocate for teachers on the floor of the House of Representatives if it wasn't for the help and advice and mentorship of one of my own high school teachers, Mr. Gustafson—or Mr. G, as I called him—of Evergreen Park Community High School. He is just one example of the many passionate, selfless educators who inspire students every day.

That is why I stand today, tomorrow, and every day in solidarity with America's teachers demanding more resources for educators and the young people that they have dedicated their lives to.

Our Nation's future depends on it.

RECOGNIZING THE RUBIN FAMILY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a family and a school community in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that is working to keep the legacy alive for a young person taken too soon.

In 1998, Jason Rubin, then a 13-year-old student at Cecelia Snyder Middle School in Bensalem, tragically succumbed to a bacterial infection. Jason was a popular kid who loved sports and played on the school's basketball team.

Shortly after Jason's passing, his parents, Richard and Gail, set up a memorial fund in his honor. The fund assists our community in various capacities, including through scholarships for Bensalem High School students.

This year, the family wanted to do something different and special. Realizing Cecelia Snyder's scoreboard was outdated, the Rubin family dedicated a new scoreboard in memory of Jason D. Rubin, a fitting tribute for their basketball-loving son. A dedication ceremony with the Rubin family present was held last week.

Madam Speaker, we applaud the service of the Rubin family and members of the Cecelia Snyder school and their community, and we are all so proud to see Jason memorialized in such a meaningful way.

HONORING GRACE GODSHALK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of a woman who lived a life defined by service, faith, and compassion.

Grace Godshalk passed away on December 15 at the age of 81. Born in Queens, New York, Grace moved to Bucks County in 1965, settling in Lower Makefield Township. Grace soon became a beloved member of our community and began devoting her time and her energy to local causes.

Later, in 1977, Grace became the first woman elected to the Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors. She served honorably for 30 years, retiring

in 2008, and, during her tenure, developed a reputation as a staunch supporter of open space initiatives, actively involved in the preservation of the Five Mile Woods Nature Preserve and the Patterson Farm.

Grace never lost her strength or her composure.

After her son, Bill, passed away in the terror attacks of 9/11, Grace played a pivotal role in the dedication of the Garden of Reflection to memorialize 9/11 victims.

Madam Speaker, our entire community sends our love to her daughter, Jane, and to her grandchildren. Grace is now reunited with her husband, James, and her legacy in our community will endure forever.

RECOGNIZING JAY SMITH

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a native of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, and a community that has rallied around him in support.

Jay Smith graduated from Central Bucks West and was diagnosed with ALS in 2014. This month, a jazz concert, dubbed "Jazz for Jay," will be held to help Jay and his family pay for medical expenses.

Jay is a writer and an inventor, a husband to Melissa, and a father to Loghan and Peyton. Despite his declining health, he currently serves on the board of directors of a foundation, Every 90 Minutes, which serves to promote research for a cure for ALS.

While he currently lives in Texas, his ties to Bucks County run deep, and our community is proud to support him in this fight.

Madam Speaker, here in Congress, we must all do our part to ensure that our medical research community has the resources needed to fight and find a cure for ALS.

I would also like to thank those participating in the Jazz for Jay ceremony and activities, and the Smith family for their advocacy.

□ 1045

SEAWALL CONSTRUCTION ON EAST SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce my introduction of a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant an easement of Federal lands for the construction of a seawall on the east shore of Staten Island.

This is the first bill I am introducing, because, since Hurricane Sandy, which absolutely devastated my district, New York City, and the region as a whole, residents in my district have lived in fear of devastating flooding. They live in fear of another superstorm. They live in fear of heavy flooding. And they live in fear of the rising cost of flood insurance.

That fear is real for my constituents. But the question isn't whether the storm will hit again; it is when.

That is why the Army Corps of Engineers, along with Federal, State, and local agencies, have worked to develop a plan to protect the lives and livelihoods of Staten Islanders by building a seawall.

Federal, State, and local funding for this project already have been secured. All that remains is for Congress to pass my bill to allow for this critical construction to begin. I made a promise when I was sworn in that if something matters to the folks who live in my district—my constituents—well, then it matters to me. That is why I am here today, and that is why I will fight to pass this bill.

I commend my predecessor, Congressman Dan Donovan, who introduced similar legislation in the previous Congress, which passed the House on a bipartisan basis, demonstrating that, when we want to, we can unite in order to enact legislation that saves American lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in Congress to act swiftly on this legislation so that we can allow construction to begin as soon as possible and bring some peace of mind to families worrying about that next storm, worrying that they are going to lose their homes.

In this time when government is shut down, it is damn time that we show the people of Staten Island, of South Brooklyn, of New York City, New York State, and the American people as a whole that government can do something positive.

DO WE HAVE A CRISIS ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER OR NOT?

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, first of all, we all are thinking about those loyal, hardworking Federal employees who are caught in the middle of the challenges that we face here in Washington. As with other battles, these employees will be paid for their time away from the workplace while they are on furlough.

So what is this all about? Do we have a crisis on the southern border or not? I would caution my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to use real numbers.

Are 400,000 illegal immigrants last year across the southern border too few or too many?

Are the 500 homicides by illegal immigrants in Texas over the past decade too few or too many?

Maybe the new Homeland Security Committee could hold a hearing and vet out all of these numbers. There is a problem with that: The committee is not organized yet, so they cannot meet. I would hope that they would, so we could put the facts on the table.

I look at the clips of large groups of illegals trying to rush the border. What has kept them from illegally entering? Well, the fence, the wall, the barrier. A wall system works. Sections of the bor-

der where fencing and walls have been built have seen a decrease in illegal immigration.

San Diego first built its wall in 1992. Illegal traffic dropped 92 percent over the past 23 years.

El Paso built their fence in 1993. Illegal traffic dropped 72 percent in 1 year and 95 percent over 22 years.

Tucson's wall was built in 2000. Illegal traffic dropped 90 percent over 15 years.

The wall in Yuma was built in 2005. Illegal traffic dropped 95 percent over 9 years.

Since walls work, they have historically held bipartisan support. In the fiscal year 2007, the DHS appropriations bill provided more than \$1 billion for fencing along the southwest border. It passed 412-6. Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, Majority Whip CLYBURN, and Homeland Security Chairman THOMPSON were among the "yes" votes.

Former President Barack Obama, in a Senate floor speech from the Secure Fence Act in 2006, said: "It will authorize some badly needed funding for better fences and better security along our borders, and that should help stem some of the tide of illegal immigration in this country."

The Secretary of Homeland Security under Obama, Janet Napolitano, reiterated: "You've got to have a system. You've got to have a system down there that includes boots on the ground, that has to include technology and fencing and infrastructure as part of the overall system."

It is time that we work together to compromise to reopen the government and secure our southern border. We can do this. I believe in this form of government, and I believe in this institution. Let's get to work.

America is an extraordinarily compassionate nation. We welcome immigrants seeking the opportunity to build a better life here, as well as refugees fleeing war, oppression, and poverty around the world. But even as we do this it is only appropriate that it is done legally.

AMERICAN OPTIMISM

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

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, during one of the most divisive times in American history, I rise today in a moment of American optimism.

In this freshly minted 116th Congress, the most diverse in our history, I welcome all new Members, young and old; Democrats and Republicans; from the North, South, East, or West; male or female; gay or straight; Jew or gentile. And I ask you to join me in this journey of optimism.

Today is the beginning of the rest of our history, the history of the opportunity we have before us to solve the Nation's critical issues that are happening today, the everyday problems that our people live with, in our diverse land.

Let us never forget who we are and the greatness we have shown the world. Let us never forget that this is the America that freed slaves, granted religious freedoms, fed the hungry, and welcomed the stranger; the America that spread democracy and freedom around the globe; the America that freed Europe and defended others from bullies and foes; the America that gave the world electricity and light. We put the first man on the Moon, flew the first woman across the pond, and created the internet and the iPhone and, yes, Facebook and Twitter, too.

We gave the world baseball and proudly root for our Olympians who lead the world in medals. We entertain the world with Hollywood, MTV, and American pop, hip-hop, Tejano, country, rock 'n' roll, and jazz music. We bring smiles and joy to children around the world through Mickey Mouse and Minnie Mouse.

We are also the country of the Mayo, Johns Hopkins, MD Anderson, and Cleveland clinics.

And all of this is while enjoying the largest economy in the world.

This is the America the world longs to be, and this is the America we have the responsibility to be, the America the world is still patiently and optimistically waiting and watching to see the next great thing we do. We are the America that came together in solidarity after 9/11. We are still that America.

To the young in this country, I promise you, you are going to be okay. There is a lot of reason to be optimistic, because I still believe that everyone serving in this body sincerely loves this country and, at the end of the day, rises to the occasion to do what is right for it.

There is nothing greater than staying united, conserving our creativity and work ethic while respecting our differences. The world is counting on us.

To you, America, I toast. I toast with a freshly brewed double espresso from Starbucks—yes, another American gem. That, my friends, is what makes America great. God bless the USA.

LONGWORTH-GARNER SPIRIT OF BIPARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, first, let me associate myself with the gentleman from Texas and his fine remarks about the strengths of this country and how this country has led the world in every way and is the envy of the world. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his inspirational remarks on this House floor.

Madam Speaker, I look forward, too, with optimism to the 116th Congress. I refuse to be pulled down by the vortex of negativism and profanity that is engulfing social media and cable television programming. Instead, I am

grateful for the opportunity to work to pursue policies that improve our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I spent my first two terms in Congress building relationships with my colleagues, in both the House and the Senate and in both political parties. I have done this based on my experiences that I had in the 1980s as a staffer on the Senate Banking Committee, as well as my 4 years of service in the executive branch in the administration of President George H.W. Bush.

I value political leaders reasoning together to find common ground to tackle our Nation's policy challenges, large and small.

In this context, I host periodic, bipartisan dinners. I call these the "Longworth-Garner Dinners," so named for Nick Longworth from Cincinnati, Ohio, Speaker of the House from 1925 to his untimely death in 1931, and his great friend, Congressman Jack Garner from Uvalde, Texas, minority leader much of the time when his friend Nick was Speaker.

These two men could not have been more different. Longworth was from a patrician family who settled in Cincinnati in the early 19th century, and he was married to Teddy Roosevelt's oldest daughter, Alice.

"Cactus Jack" Garner was a rough-and-tumble small-town lawyer from Uvalde who rose to be a successful county judge and then became a terrifically successful Member of the U.S. House. As Garner put it, "I was the heathen, and Nick was the aristocrat."

Longworth and Garner came to Congress at the same time in 1902. Both served with distinction; both rose to the top of their political parties; and both were terrific friends.

When Longworth was sworn into speakership for the last time in April of 1929, he paid tribute to his friend, the minority leader and future Speaker, by saying: "The gentleman from Texas and I entered Congress together 26 years ago. That he is a better man than I, in the estimation of his constituents, is made clear by the fact that his service has been continuous, whereas mine was interrupted by a vacation of 2 years, by no means of my own motion. During all these years, our friendship has been continuously abiding, and our affection, esteem, and respect, the one for the other, is and has been, I am proud to say, mutual."

For his part, on the untimely death of Longworth in 1931, Garner, who did become Speaker, said: "He was an aristocrat; I am a plebeian. Perhaps . . . our different rearing intensified our interest in each other. I have lost one of the best friends of a lifetime, the country a good citizen, and the Congress a most valued legislator."

It was "Cactus Jack" and Nick who cooked up the tradition in room H-128 of the U.S. Capitol. Each afternoon, no matter how much fighting took place on the floor of the U.S. House, they retreated to H-128, which they nick-

named the "Bureau of Education," to have a drink and "strike a blow for liberty."

Room H-128 went on to even greater fame, as longtime Speaker Sam Rayburn from Texas continued this tradition that he had witnessed as a young Member.

The purpose of my Longworth-Garner Dinners is to get to know each other, to understand what our goals and objectives are for our constituents and how we can work effectively together on the House Financial Services Committee.

Madam Speaker, I will continue the tradition of Longworth and Garner in the 116th Congress. I look forward to working hand-in-hand and shoulder-to-shoulder with my colleagues in both parties and on both sides of the U.S. Capitol to move this country forward and seek a better Nation through our partnership.

END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge President Trump and Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL to reopen the Federal Government. Let's be clear: the crisis is not along our Nation's southern border. The real crisis is getting people back to work.

I cannot stand by silently while nearly 800,000 Federal workers, thousands of which are in New Mexico, won't receive a paycheck, and countless, innocent people suffer because they will not receive essential services from the Federal Government.

The government shutdown impacts the State of New Mexico more than almost anywhere in this country. The government shutdown directly affects more than 6,000 Federal employees throughout New Mexico. These dedicated public servants are not getting paid, but they still need to pay the rent, put food on the table, and they still need to make payments on their car loans and student loans.

Almost 50,000 residents of New Mexico's First Congressional District depend on SNAP benefits to feed their families. The government shutdown means that SNAP benefits are threatened.

As someone who relied on government assistance programs when I was raising my daughter as a single mom, I have been there, and I know that it is devastating for these people to worry about how they are going to pay for their next meal and take care of their families.

Our Indian tribes, pueblos, and nations who rely on Federal funding for aging services and Indian Health Services for medical care, are already being impacted by this shutdown, and the suffering will grow greater as the shutdown drags on. If this shutdown continues, 62 percent of Indian Health

Services will be forced to cease offering services, and 54 percent will be forced to lay off essential staff. This is a recipe for disaster.

On the Navajo Nation in my State, people have been trapped in their homes without food, water, and medicine because the government has failed to fund the Federal maintenance to plow snow from the roads.

The Department of Agriculture's Food Distribution Program on Indian reservations runs out of funding at the end of this month. This program provides nutrition assistance to nearly 90,000 Native Americans.

Madam Speaker, I voted to pass legislation through this House that Democrats have put forward to reopen the government. What we need now is Senator MITCH MCCONNELL and President Trump to show that same kind of leadership and act on these bills, which the Senate already passed last year, and reopen our government.

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 11 o'clock and 2 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: Thank You, O Lord, for giving us another day.

Lord, You are ever present, the source of all wisdom and self-giving love. The Sacred Scriptures reveal Your continued guidance in human affairs. We thank You for the many blessings granted this Nation throughout its history.

In these early days of the 116th Congress, we seek Your mercy and rely on Your revelations to guide and protect this legislative body. With renewed standards of ethics and a deeper commitment of accountability, may all who serve in public office be Your steady instruments in unifying, protecting, and guiding the American people of this democracy to increasing virtue, greater prosperity, and witness to goodness for the world.

We thank You, again, for the inspiration of our Nation's Founders and the legacy they left us. May the Members of this assembly and all Americans be worthy of that legacy.

May all that is done this day be done 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas 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.

SWEARING IN OF DELEGATE

The SPEAKER. Will Ms. PLASKETT present herself in the well.

All Members will rise and Ms. PLASKETT will please raise her right hand.

Ms. PLASKETT appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOYER). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HEALTHCARE

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, healthcare is important, and no one knows that better than our country's nurses. As the first registered nurse elected to Congress, I know how the Affordable Care Act has improved our country's healthcare, especially for the 133 million Americans living with pre-existing conditions, including 11.5 million who live in my home State of Texas, the most uninsured State in the Nation.

Today, we are bringing a resolution to the floor which will empower the House of Representatives, the people's House, to intervene in a lawsuit that Republicans have brought solely to throw the American healthcare system into chaos. I urge my colleagues to

support the Allred resolution and vote to protect the healthcare of millions of our fellow Americans.

INAUGURATION DAY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolinians today will celebrate the inauguration of Governor Henry McMaster, Lieutenant Governor Pamela Evette, and Attorney General Alan Wilson, along with all of our other constitutional officers.

After serving 2 years as Governor succeeding Governor Nikki Haley, Henry McMaster enters his first full term. He has dedicated his life to serving our citizens. Best wishes to Henry, First Lady Peggy, and their two children, Henry, Jr., and Mary Rodgers.

The Governor's running mate, Pamela Evette, is a successful business leader to serve as Lieutenant Governor. Her husband, David, and children, Amanda, Joseph, and Jackson, will make a positive difference.

Our oldest son, Alan, was sworn in for a third term today after becoming the youngest attorney general in the Nation in 2011. Our family is very grateful for his and his wife Jennifer's success, with our grandchildren, Michael and Anna Grace.

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

IN SUPPORT OF COVERAGE FOR
PREEXISTING CONDITIONS

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, one in two, the number of Delawareans living with a preexisting condition, including cancer survivors and those with chronic diseases.

Before the Affordable Care Act, having a preexisting condition meant your access to healthcare was in jeopardy. You could be charged unaffordable premiums with limited benefits or denied coverage outright. Because of the ACA, the fear of not being able to find coverage has been replaced with the guarantee of lifesaving protections.

To those who want to roll back those protections, I ask you to think about the Delawareans caring for a newborn with congenital heart disease, those struggling to overcome substance use disorder, or the many monitoring their blood sugar up to 10 times a day.

Just 9 years ago, this body rightfully promised to protect those very people. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in defending strong protections for people with preexisting conditions and reject efforts to turn back the clock on millions of Americans and their families.

URGING FEDERAL RECOGNITION OF THE LITTLE SHELL TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MONTANA

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to provide the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana with the overdue Federal recognition they deserve.

The Little Shell Tribe began petitioning the Federal Government for recognition in the 1930s, several generations ago. Mr. Speaker, 80 years later, the resolute Tribe continues their efforts.

Last year, the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians Restoration Act passed this House unanimously. It was the first time that a bill providing Federal recognition of the Little Shell Tribe passed either the House or the Senate.

Following passage in the House, however, this uncontroversial bill hit a roadblock in the Senate. We take up their worthy cause again today as I introduce the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I call on this body to consider and pass this bill again. This Congress should provide the Little Shell Tribe with the Federal recognition it deserves, particularly after eight decades of dedicated efforts.

RISING IN SUPPORT OF
BACKGROUND CHECKS

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, a commonsense bill to mandate background checks before the sale of a firearm.

During my first term in Congress, I served with my friend and former Congresswoman Gabby Giffords on the Armed Services Committee. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago this week, during a public meeting with her constituents, a gunman shot her and 18 others, tragically killing 6.

Since that dark day in 2011, mass shootings have become commonplace, occurring in our schools, houses of worship, movie theaters, nightclubs, grocery stores, a newsroom, a concert, nearly every place imaginable that should be safe.

Although 97 percent of Americans support background checks, many Members of Congress simply pass along thoughts and prayers in the face of these tragedies instead of taking action.

Enough. The Nation's gun violence epidemic must be addressed by the 116th Congress.

I am in awe of Gabby's resilience and advocacy for overdue gun safety reforms like H.R. 8, which will ensure

that firearms do not end up in the hands of those who cannot pass a simple background check.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING OKANOGAN COUNTY SHERIFF FRANK ROGERS

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I rise to honor Frank Rogers, who has served the public in his role as Okanogan County sheriff for the past 16 years. In his own words, Sheriff Rogers "bleeds cop."

He spent the past three decades in the northern part of my district working to improve his community and promoting camaraderie among different law enforcement agencies. From solving burglaries and violent crime cases to helping evacuate those affected by devastating wildfires, Frank has been dedicated to his friends and neighbors. Also known as Sheriff Batman, he acted as a superhero for the people of Okanogan County.

Sheriff Rogers signed off for the last time on December 31, and I know he is excited to spend more time with his wife, Minette, and his family. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on a successful career and wishing him all the best in the future.

REOPENING OF SHEA'S SENECA BUILDING

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the storied Shea's Seneca building on Seneca Street in South Buffalo reopens to the public after 18 months of extensive renovations made possible by Federal and State historic tax credits.

Built in 1929, the former movie theater was the anchor of the once-thriving Seneca Street business district, and it will reopen this Thursday. The use of Federal historic tax credits added more than \$1 million to this historic preservation project.

There is new hope and optimism about the future of Seneca Street because of the vision of developer Jake Schneider and his wise use of the Federal Historic Tax Credit program that made the Shea's Seneca project a reality.

CELEBRATING LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

(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, I rise today on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day to com-

mend law enforcement officers throughout our Nation who answer the call to serve their communities. This day is designated annually on January 9 to show support to our law enforcement leaders in every community, including our Capitol Police, who are with us here each and every day.

Law enforcement officers face increasingly difficult circumstances while working to serve and protect the public. It is a dangerous job, and, often, it is a thankless job. Our officers put on their uniforms each day knowing that they can be in harm's way at any moment. They answer the call in times of distress, and they follow the rules and wear the badge proudly.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that our officers are mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, husbands and wives. They are humans, and they arguably have one of the most difficult jobs in America.

So today and each day, let's honor our brothers and sisters in blue. Let's thank them for the important work that they do to keep us all safe.

□ 1215

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's irresponsible shutdown is in its 19th day. America's working families are bearing the brunt.

In Illinois alone, more than 7,000 Federal workers are going without pay. Without a solution, more Americans, and our Nation's economy, will suffer. Tax refunds that families depend on could be frozen or delayed.

Nutrition assistance programs could be reduced. The Northern Illinois Food Bank is now dipping in to reserves to operate without USDA funding.

Air travelers, already experiencing longer lines as TSA struggles to staff checkpoints with workers who aren't being paid, will incur even longer delays.

None of this is necessary. Last week, this new Congress passed bipartisan bills to fully reopen our government. This week we will pass them again, department by department.

The President needs to stop holding our Federal agencies and the livelihoods of thousands of families hostage. The Senate needs to take "yes" for an answer and vote to open the government now. Then we can continue the debate on how best to secure our border.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF KEN SCHWEBEL

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a constituent and a

friend of mine, Mr. Ken Schwebel, of Mount Joy, Pennsylvania, who faithfully served as the chairman of the Keystone Chapter of Associated Builders and Contractors in 2018. Ken also currently serves as the president of the Witmer Group, a leading regional masonry company.

Ken led the Keystone ABC Chapter through many milestones during his time as chair. Under his leadership, the chapter chartered its first-ever college student chapter from Millersville University, and also taught middle-school children more about construction through two Construction War programs.

The chapter also had a record number of participants in networking events, and had the largest enrollment in its apprenticeship program under Ken's leadership.

I would like to congratulate and thank Ken for his service to the construction industry and to our community.

WE CAN DO BETTER

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today, on Twitter, President Trump threatened to withhold FEMA disaster money from California.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the President doesn't know what FEMA disaster funding goes for. It helps rebuild homes. It helps folks rebuild schools, hospitals.

Maybe the President doesn't know that we have suffered devastating wildfires in California. We have lost close to 28,000 structures. We have had billions of dollars of damage. Close to my district, 14,000 homes were lost.

Mr. Speaker, what makes America great is when our neighbors, our fellow countrymen suffer a tragedy, we come together as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, what I find disgusting is that the President seems to lack the compassion to know that fellow Americans are suffering right now.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than that.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DAY

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address the House on National Law Enforcement Day.

I am not sure we are all aware of the demands and risks that the men and women in uniform face every day when they go out to work. They respond to the call always, every day, in bad weather, in disasters, at huge risk.

They often don't know what to expect, but they respond. They respond to domestic violence. They respond in issues of drug trafficking. They respond when there are bullets flying, and they do it without hesitation.

I want to honor all of them, and their families, that go every day, put on a uniform and protect all of us. And, in particular, I want to say thank you to my oldest son who, as a six year old, decided he wanted to be a police officer, and continues to serve every day protecting his family and our community.

And I want to thank all the law enforcement officers that, every day, get up to keep us safe.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night, the President went on television in an attempt to justify his decision to shut down our government and plunge our country into chaos. He claims that we are in the middle of an emergency, and I actually agree with him on that. I just don't agree on what the emergency is.

It is an emergency that more than 5,200 Federal workers in Michigan are working without pay, or are furloughed.

It is an emergency that the Environmental Protection Agency has halted inspections of our drinking water systems.

And it is an emergency that our President is ready to spend, in his words, "years" prolonging this shutdown and hurting American families for the sake of an ineffective and expensive border wall.

On day 1, House Democrats took the first steps to clean up this mess by passing a complete funding package to reopen our government. Now we are preparing further action to reopen all government agencies, one by one, and remove any doubt that hardworking Americans will receive their tax refunds and the services they depend on.

Enough is enough. Michiganders can't afford one more day of the Trump shutdown.

PROTECTING AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Illinois 14th elected me as their Representative to protect their access to healthcare coverage and to make healthcare and prescription drugs more affordable.

I am a nurse, and I have a preexisting condition and so I know, personally, how critically important having high-quality affordable healthcare is for people.

Today, we are taking an essential step to protect access to affordable coverage from the GOP's cruel lawsuit which seeks to destroy the Affordable Care Act and its lifesaving protection.

My community sent me here to use my voice and my vote as their neighbor

and as a nurse, and I am proud to vote today to protect people with pre-existing conditions; to prohibit insurance companies from imposing lifetime and annual limits on health coverage; and to preserve young adults' ability to remain on their parents' insurance until age 26, and more.

I commend my colleague, Mr. ALLRED, and am proud to join my Democratic colleagues in wasting no time delivering on our promise to defeat Republican attacks on the Affordable Care Act, and to fight for the people, and to protect Americans with pre-existing conditions.

GUN SAFETY REFORM

(Mr. TED LIEU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my condolences to the families of the three individuals whose lives were cut tragically short because of gun violence in my district.

Last Friday, a senseless shooting at a bowling alley in Torrance claimed the lives of Michael Radford, Robert Meekins, and Astin Edwards, while injuring four others.

Gable House Bowl, where the mass shooting took place, is a staple in my hometown. It is a place where I have visited; where my kids have celebrated birthdays; where folks in my community go to spend quality time together, and it should have been a place last Friday where people of all ages could have had fun safely.

My heart aches for the victims' families who lost their loved ones in a senseless, preventable manner. I am also dismayed that our community now joins an ever-growing cohort of communities touched by mass shootings.

Gun safety reform is a complicated task, but I am grateful that the House, now under Democratic leadership, is taking this challenge on. Yesterday, we introduced H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, which is an excellent place to start addressing gun safety reform. We must continue to push for sensible gun safety measures.

DO THE RIGHT THING NOW

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

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, my district lies just outside of Washington, D.C., in northern Virginia, and is home to tens of thousands of Federal workers and contractors. Since I was sworn in on Thursday, I have received hundreds of calls, emails, and social media outreach from my constituents whose lives are upended. I would like to read one of those messages now.

I am a Federal employee who used the last of his discretionary funds this week to attend his grandfather's funeral. Now I'm pre-

paring to file for unemployment. My wife has to try to get a job despite her severe and crippling disability, and we've had to return some of the Christmas presents for ourselves, our four-year-old son, and our six-year-old daughter.

We've always lived paycheck to paycheck because of the high cost of living in northern Virginia, and we don't have the option to take out loans because we incurred so much debt moving to the area and dealing with our family's medical bills.

Right now I am contacting our utilities and mortgage company to see if we can push out the deadlines for bills. I gave up military service to join the civil service and have been so disheartened to see the lack of respect for our Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, we owe our Federal employees better than this. I call on the Senate and the President to do the right thing and end this shutdown now.

THE UNNECESSARY AND RECKLESS GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great disappointment that I rise today on the 19th day of this unnecessary and reckless government shutdown.

Just last week, this body passed the very same Republican funding bills that would open the government and keep Americans safe and secure.

My community in south Florida is home to one of the biggest airports in our Nation, Miami International Airport. Just yesterday, 130,000 passengers passed through the airport. Yet, TSA employees, air traffic controllers, and Customs and Border Protection agents who inspect international cargo are forced to work without pay, and must deal with the unbearable decision of choosing between paying for healthcare or putting food on the table.

Nearly a quarter of the households in my district rely on food stamps. If this shutdown continues, these families are at risk of losing access to food.

There is absolutely no reason why families should be evicted from their homes or go hungry because their nutrition benefits were left unprocessed.

There is absolutely no reason why the Everglades and Biscayne National Parks, and our national treasures around the country, must continue to rely on the kindness of devoted volunteers to keep them from deteriorating.

Mr. Speaker, I have been through a shutdown before. I oversaw 125,000 employees at HHS during the longest shutdown.

No one wins in a shutdown. It was painful.

MEDGAR EVERS HOME NATIONAL MONUMENT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce H.R.

356, the Medgar Evers Home National Monument Act. The home is located in Jackson, Mississippi.

The Evers family home, which was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2017, is hallowed ground for those of us who lived through the struggle for racial equality and desegregation. That single-story, ranch-style home bore witness to one of the most consequential monuments in the civil rights era, the assassination of Medgar Wiley Evers.

I am honored to, in my capacity as Congressman of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, to offer this legislation to honor the sacrifice of not just civil rights icon Medgar Evers, but his widow, Myrlie, by designating their home as a national monument.

Due to bipartisan efforts last Congress, this legislation passed through the Committee on Natural Resources and ultimately passed the House by unanimous consent. I am asking that we make this happen again and honor the legacy of an icon in American history, Medgar Wiley Evers.

I urge everyone to support this legislation.

LET'S REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT TODAY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are about to witness the longest government shutdown in U.S. history. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, many in my own district, are not certain when or if their next paycheck is coming, and for what? For what? For a border wall?

Mr. Speaker, in San Diego, we know walls. We have a triple fence, and we know there are real concerns on the border. Let's work on solving those problems. Spending billions of dollars on a wall won't.

In San Diego, we have the most modern port of entry in the country. It works well to catch drugs and stop criminals. If the President wants border security, well, that, that should be our focus.

Paola Avila, of the San Diego Chamber said it best: "Our border region is an opportunity zone, not a danger zone."

Let's take that opportunity and work to improve our border, not waste money on a wall. And let's not waste any more time. Federal employees want to get back to work.

We have already passed legislation, bipartisan legislation, to end this shutdown. Let's reopen the government today.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to deliver my first floor speech today speaking about an issue that is deeply personal to me, to the patients that I care for as a pediatrician, and to thousands of my constituents in Washington's Eighth District.

As you know, the lawful nature of the Affordable Care Act has been challenged, and if the decision stands, 17 million Americans will lose their health insurance. This includes many of my patients, children, and people with preexisting conditions.

Having seen families struggle to pay ever higher insurance premiums and deductibles every year, I understand that we need improvements in our system. The answer is to shore up the ACA, not dismantle it. And as the lone woman doctor in Congress and as a patient with type 1 diabetes, I look forward to leading that conversation.

The first step is to preserve the protections that we have now, and that is why I am so pleased that the House will take steps to intervene in this court case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to consider the fates of their constituents who might not have access to medical care without the Affordable Care Act and to support this intervention. Millions of Americans and thousands in my district are counting on us.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES 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. 31

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Deutch, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Ms. Lofgren, Chair.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 264, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 265, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 266, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 267, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 28 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 28

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. Each such bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 265) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 266) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

(d) The bill (H.R. 267) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. 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 January 15, 2019, relating to a measure 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. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, the ranking member, 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. Mr. 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 28, providing for consideration of H.R. 264, making appropriations for financial services and general government; H.R. 265, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs; H.R. 266, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies; and H.R. 267, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies, each for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. The rule provides for consideration of each bill under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass these bills, because we need to reopen government.

Let me just say to my colleagues, quite frankly, this is not the way I had hoped we would start the new Congress, essentially cleaning up the mess that my Republican friends left us from the last Congress, but we are where we are, and this is an emergency. It is time to reopen the government.

Mr. Speaker, what we saw last night from the President, in my opinion, was a disgrace. He used the Oval Office to fearmonger and smear immigrants. There was nothing new, no plan to get us out of this shutdown, no solutions, just more of the same offensive rhetoric we have heard time and time again from this President.

But this Democratic majority is moving quickly to end the Trump shutdown. On day one of this new Congress, we passed a complete funding package using bipartisan language to reopen government, and now, today, we are taking further action to help the American people while responsibly protecting our borders.

This rule will allow us to pass individual appropriations bills to reopen key government agencies. That includes the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service, to prevent Americans' tax refunds from being withheld during the shutdown; the Department of Agriculture, to prevent hungry families from losing the lifeline of SNAP benefits and assure that our farmers get the services that

they need; the Department of the Interior, to prevent our national parks and monuments from being further degraded and allow EPA to resume its work protecting public health and our environment; and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to help hardworking families in the process of realizing the dream of homeownership. These bills offer us a way out of the President's shutdown, an embarrassing spectacle that never should have happened in the first place.

Nineteen days ago, the President of the United States threw a temper tantrum. He went back on his word, breaking his promise to sign bipartisan appropriations bills that would have prevented a quarter of our government from shutting down.

He turned on FOX News or some rightwing radio show somewhere and changed his mind. Suddenly, the President demanded \$5 billion in funding for his offensive border wall just to keep the lights on—billions of dollars, by the way, that would just have been a downpayment on an unnecessary project that would cost tens of billions of dollars, and not at Mexico's expense like President Trump promised over and over and over and over again.

Now the costs have been shifted to the American taxpayer, when, according to Reuters/Ipsos polling, only 25 percent of the public says they support Trump shutting down the government over the wall—25 percent. This is crazy, but this doesn't have to continue.

At his press conference the other day, the President boasted he could keep our government closed for years. Now, he may not know how to get us out of this mess, but this Democratic majority does, and there are many responsible Republicans on the other side of the aisle who are with us on reopening the government.

Last week, our funding package passed with bipartisan support. Seven Republicans voted with us, including Republican Congressman WILL HURD, whose district includes much of the U.S.-Mexico border.

In addition, a growing number of Senate Republicans have encouraged the majority leader to bring those bills to the floor, including Senator COLLINS of Maine and Senator GARDNER of Colorado. Senator GARDNER said, recently: "The Senate has done it last Congress; we should do it again today," and I agree.

So let's send these bills to the Senate so they can once again pass Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support.

The Senate Majority Leader already supported these bills once. Why not support them again to finally reopen this government?

Because we can't wait for the President to publicly promise to sign these bills before we act—we already know his word isn't worth much; his broken promise is what got us here—it has fallen to Congress to get us out of this shutdown.

Congressman HURD said after voting for the Democratic appropriations

package last week: "Ultimately, Congress is a coequal branch of government, and it should operate that way." He is absolutely right. And these bills are this majority's latest attempt to fulfill our responsibility.

There are 40 million Americans who rely on SNAP to put food on the table. Their benefits will lapse shortly if this shutdown is allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, why should Americans go hungry just because the President wants to appease someone like Rush Limbaugh? Why in the world would Congress sit idly by as thousands of people trying to buy a new home or refinance FHA-insured mortgages are left in limbo?

We are now in tax season. If we don't end this shutdown, more than 2 million Americans who every month turn to tax assistance centers will find them closed as they try to complete their annual returns.

This is madness, and it is completely unnecessary. Tax returns delayed, home purchases in limbo, food assistance in jeopardy for the hungry, trash piling up in our national parks, it is an embarrassment—not to mention the 800,000 Federal workers who aren't getting paid, and countless more contractors.

It can be over in a heartbeat if we pass these bills and the Senate takes yes for an answer. These bills honor our responsibility to turn the lights back on. They don't waste even a dollar of taxpayer money on the President's immoral border wall, nor should they. People overwhelmingly object to building it.

I hope this President comes to his senses, that he stops holding our Nation hostage as he plays to the fringes of his base. But none of us can control that. We do have the ability, though, to do our jobs and to end the shutdown. That is what this Congress will do again today, and I urge all of my colleagues to join with us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is constrained to again remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are back again on appropriations, and we are back again on the exact same set of bills as before.

Last week, the House agreed, over Republican objections, to pass a set of appropriations bills, six of which would fund the relevant departments for a full year, the seventh of which would fund the Department of Homeland Security until February 8.

Today, not content with already having passed these bills once, my friends in the majority are again bringing up four individual bills that were part of the same package covering the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development bill, Financial Services and

general government bill, the Agriculture bill, and the Interior and Environment bill. Nothing substantive in these bills has changed. Indeed, nothing substantive has yet changed anywhere in this process:

The government remains partially shut down;

The Senate is refusing to pass the bills my Democratic Party colleagues are proposing;

The President is refusing to sign them; and

The majority is proposing to fix the problem by passing the exact same bills.

To quote the great Yogi Berra: "It is déjà vu all over again."

While I commend my friends in the majority for trying to reopen the government, let's be clear about what they are proposing. The four bills under consideration here represent only the Senate-passed versions of the bills covering the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process. They represent no input at all from the House, no input at all from the Appropriations Committee, and no input at all from the joint House and Senate conference committees that were appointed to iron out the differences between these bills and their House counterparts.

In essence, the Democrats' only plan is for the House to swallow the Senate's original bills, abrogate our authority and responsibility as a coequal House of Congress, and declare victory. What is more surprising is that my friends now expect that having tried this same thing before, they will now get a different result.

To be clear, last week, when the House passed these exact same bills, the Senate made it known these bills would not come to the floor; and even if they did, the President has made it known that he would not sign them. I don't know what they think is so different about this week over last to make my friends think that all they need to do is to pass them again and, magically, the Senate will pass these bills and the President will sign them.

□ 1245

Perhaps even more surprising, the majority now wishes to bring these four bills forward under a closed rule, with no opportunity for the House to amend them and no opportunity for Members to weigh in. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I understand how hard it is to have a full process on appropriations bills. But it is, indeed, possible, even when funding bills carry over into a new year or even a new majority.

In 2011, right after Republicans took majority control of the House, we considered a bill on the floor to fund the entire Federal Government. We did it under an open rule, with only a preprinting requirement. When we considered that bill on the floor, 162 amendments were offered from both sides of the aisle, and we had a grand total of 66 hours of floor debate on the bill, stretching out over 5 days.

Given the amount of time we used in 2011, I fully understand what an undertaking that would be. But unless the majority believes that these bills will quickly pass the Senate and quickly be signed by the President into law, then there is plenty of time for thoughtful debate and plenty of time to hear ideas from all Members of this House. Instead, the majority has chosen to push forward with an appropriations strategy that they know cannot succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the House should be taking steps this week to negotiate with the Senate and the President to end this shutdown. That means that, whether the majority likes it or not, they need to engage on border security.

The American people have told us time and time again that they want action on border security. The solution they are proposing today does nothing on that front.

Even if we pass these bills today, and even if they, ultimately, became law, the border would remain unsecured and the Department of Homeland Security would remain shut down. Nothing the House will do in this package will change that essential fact, and nothing in this package is a step on the road to changing that essential fact.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't always this way. In 2006, 64 Democrats joined Republicans in passing the Secure Fence Act, which President Bush signed into law. Those 64 Democrats then included 13 current Members now and one additional Member who has since gone on to the Senate. Even liberal lions of the House, like our good friend and former colleague Congressman Barney Frank, joined the Republicans in voting for border security. I am unclear what has changed, from then until now, that would cause the entire majority Caucus to refuse to work with Republicans on border security when so many did so back in 2006.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, while I agree with the good intentions of the majority in seeking to fund the government, their method of doing so is in no way sufficient. Instead of abrogating our own authority, embracing a Senate-only product that the President will not sign, and kicking the can down the road, we should be taking concrete steps to reopen the government, secure the border, and move on to the many important needs of the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma's comments. I just want to make a couple of quick points before yielding to my next speaker.

We, as Democrats, are struggling in support of border security, and we have supported initiative after initiative to basically make our borders more secure. We believe in investing in infrastructure and more personnel. We be-

lieve in providing more judges to be able to adjudicate asylum claims so we can process people more expeditiously. We believe in technology. It is 2019, yet the President insists on this medieval approach to border security, which most experts say is just ineffective.

On top of all of that, our objection is that it is going to cost tens of billions of dollars. The President said that Mexico is going to pay for it, but now he is saying that the American taxpayers are going to pay for it. I mean, give me a break.

As far as why we are doing the strategy of taking up these Senate-passed bills, let me remind my colleagues: They passed the Senate 92-6 back in August.

I would have liked a different process. My friends were in charge of everything up to a week ago. They controlled the House; they controlled the Senate; and they controlled the White House. Yet they sent people home during the holidays and just kicked the can down the road, and we have inherited this mess from the last Congress. So we are doing the best we can.

If the Senate would vote, like they did in August, again for these bills—92-6—we won't need the President. We could override his veto; we could reopen the government; and we could stop all of this nonsense right now. That is my hope.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this administration to choose people over politics.

As we are talking about the shutdown, the stories of real people are getting lost in the mess created by this administration. I want to share the serious impact of the shutdown on my constituents and Americans around the country.

These stories come from hardworking families, like newlyweds in my district who just had a premature baby. They spent 3 weeks in the NICU and are just now getting back home. They told me: "We have so many bills and a mortgage, and the shutdown happened just as we are sending in our first mortgage payment. Our baby requires special formula because he was not able to breastfeed. My husband has been asked to work overtime and is not getting paid. We are scared about how we are going to get by."

This is a national crisis, one our President has created, and we have a responsibility to fix it.

I call on the White House, my colleagues across the aisle, and their colleagues in the Senate to stop holding our government hostage and allow the government to reopen as we debate effective and humane border security.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of quick points, and then yield to another speaker, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, I want to disagree a little bit with my friend's memory on

what the last Congress did and did not do. Quite frankly, it was the most successful Congress in enacting appropriations bills in 22 years, 75 percent of them across the floor on time. We will see how good the record is as my friends are in the majority. And I am going to work with my friends on that, because I know it is the intention to do that, but it is no easy task.

To say that the last Congress didn't act when, in fact, it put a bill over in the United States Senate that the President would have signed is simply untrue. To suggest that Republicans controlled the Senate in this process, when a Democratic minority in the Senate kept us from getting to 60 votes, there is where your real obstruction was. Quite frankly, this problem would have never happened if the Senate chose to operate the way we do, by simple majority vote, and the President would have had a bill.

One last point, if I may. The President did offer to negotiate. The reports in the media are that he actually offered to reduce his request by half. That is normally, around here, considered a real negotiation: Let's split the difference and find the common ground.

My friends didn't choose to take up that offer. So the idea that they have somehow been innocent bystanders when they were in the minority, in a process out of control, simply misstates reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my good friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee, and a former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding me some time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Last night, the Rules Committee, under its new chairman, Mr. McGOVERN, voted to bring four spending bills to the House floor, four bills that have never had a hearing in this body, have never had a markup in this body, and now, under Democratic control of the House, will have no amendments made in order.

These bills may sound familiar to my constituents because these are the exact same bills that House Democrats forced votes on last week, only now we will be considering them one by one, rather than in a large package.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rules Committee over the last 4 years, I can tell you I had the distinct honor of listening to the now-chairman of the Rules Committee spend hours, literally hours, berating those of us in the majority for not allowing amendments on bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can understand my full expectation as Democrats took control of this body that we would be seeing open rules allowing for vigorous debate on amendments and healthy, open dialogue and transparency on these important pieces of legislation. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the now-chairman who spoke of his frustrations with the Rules Committee in recent months.

First of all:

The Rules Committee ought to be a place where people who have good ideas, whether you agree with them or not, have legitimate ideas, ought to be able to have the opportunity to be able to offer them. Increasingly, we're moving away from that.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker:

I'm always intrigued by the excuses why we can't be open . . . and decry this very closed process.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker:

I hope if we're lucky enough to take over this place, I hope that we're more accommodating.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they were, in fact, lucky enough. The Democrats took control of this body and very well could be allowing amendments today. But, unfortunately, that is not the case.

For instance, last night, I offered three amendments to two of the bills before us, all three of which were accepted unanimously in the 115th Congress in the House Appropriations Committee, again, on a bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, the chairman isn't allowing a single amendment on the Republican or Democratic side to be offered on any of these four bills, including bipartisan amendments like those that I had offered.

I thank my good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his effort to push these amendments to be made in order. It is sincerely disappointing to see the chairman and House Democrats manage legislation in the very manner they so vehemently decried.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on this rule and "no" on these spending bills.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. My constituents' priorities deserve to be represented in the people's House. Unfortunately, in this bill, they are not.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Washington State, a former member of the Rules Committee. I should just tell him—and I am a little bit surprised, since he was on the Rules Committee—two of his amendments that he offered didn't even comply with the House rules, so that is why they wouldn't be made in order.

But let me just say to him, as I began my remarks, it is unfortunate that we had to start this Congress cleaning up after the last Congress, but that is where we are. That is what you have given us. And I am eager to return to regular order as soon as we reopen this government.

What we are witnessing is extraordinary. In fact, it is unprecedented. For

the first time in history, we have begun a new Congress in the middle of a government shutdown.

I tried last month to bring up appropriations bills, bills that Mr. HOYER offered on the floor to reopen this government, but you shut me down every single time, so here we are.

We meant it when we said that we would do everything we can to reopen this government, because this is a real emergency. 800,000 hardworking civil servants are either furloughed or working without pay. That is what an emergency looks like. This is an emergency.

I appreciate the kind of laid-back attitude of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle who are like: Well, let's start all over again. Let's reopen the process. Let's have endless debate from now until whenever.

But do you know what? It is not us who are not being paid; it is our constituents. So this is an emergency. It is time that all of us come together and end this ridiculous shutdown and then get on to the business of the future. That is what I am committed to.

I hope that the Rules Committee will be much more accommodating to my friends on the other side of the aisle than my friends were to us, by the way, overseeing the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule and the four underlying bills to help fully reopen the United States of America. Here we are, 19 days into the Trump shutdown, and all we see is political posturing from the White House and the Republican-controlled Senate, which has failed to take any steps to reopen the government.

The President has made Federal employees political pawns to try and get his way. He has put America and the hardworking men and women who work for her in jeopardy.

□ 1300

Last week, I joined a bipartisan majority of the House in supporting two bills to fully reopen the government. Unfortunately, the Senate has failed to take up those bills. They would immediately reopen the government and put 800,000 people back to work.

I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma said we have plenty of time. Those were his words just now. We don't have plenty of time. We need to get people back to work.

I want to share some stories from my district. Denver Federal Center is in the middle of my district, and it has the highest concentration of Federal agencies anywhere in the country outside of the D.C. area.

More than 15,000 of these and other Federal workers in Colorado have either been furloughed or forced to continue working without knowing whether they will be paid or not.

One of these employees is Sherry who works for the EPA. Sherry is furloughed and doesn't know when she will get back to work or if she will be paid when the EPA reopens. Sherry has two sons with disabilities who rely on counseling and treatment not covered by her insurance. She is being forced to make decisions about how to continue their treatment, pay for groceries, and keep up with her family's other expenses.

Or take Shannon, who is a supervisor for the TSA. Shannon is still on the job but doesn't know when she and her coworkers are going to get paid for work. Shannon told my office: If the shutdown lasts through this month, it will be nearly impossible for her family to make rent. They barely made January payments and still have outstanding utility and credit card bills.

I also met with Matt this morning who is an air traffic controller in Denver. He and his coworkers have stayed on the job keeping our skies and the traveling public safe, but will not receive paychecks on Friday.

One more story is from Gabe who lives in Wheat Ridge, Colorado, where I live. Gabe is a student who called my office concerned he won't be able to start classes at the University of Colorado because his registration with the Selective Service System cannot be processed until the government reopens.

These are just a few examples of why we need to fully reopen the government. I urge my friend from Oklahoma to work with Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. MCGOVERN to come up with solutions to this, to get these people back to work as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take up the challenge. I would be happy to meet with anybody to reopen the government. I would be happy if we had a product in front of us, which we did have in late December that had actually been agreed to by the United States Senate.

Why my friends chose to just simply take the Senate bills—which I will assure you, are not nearly as good as the conference bills between the two bodies—and throw all of the work out that this body did over a year, the appropriators, and the rest of the authorizing committees that play a supplemental role in this, I will never know.

It would have been a lot harder to vote "no" than just simply sit here and strip 435 Members of their ability to legislate, which is effectively what my friends in the majority have chosen to do.

I hope going forward we can do exactly what my friend suggests. I would also suggest that the people he mentioned go meet with the President of the United States. He was here all December, happy to negotiate with anybody. He wasn't in Hawaii. He was here. He offered to split the difference. That was an unacceptable offer to my friends.

So if you want to negotiate, negotiate with the President. If you want to do something with the Senate, I would expect that you should probably sit down and talk to them because you are sending them something this week that you sent last week, that they didn't take up then, and they are not going to take up now.

So whenever we want to negotiate, I would be thrilled to be at the table, but I haven't seen any evidence that my friends do want to negotiate. Instead, they simply want to dictate. They simply want to dictate the outcome and achieve what they think is a political victory, and that is coming at the expense of the American people. Real negotiations mean sitting down and settling differences. It doesn't mean shooting paper back and forth across the rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend and a distinguished Member.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has to recognize the irony, how, despite 2 years of claiming that he wants open rules, the Democrat rule package talking about regular order, and here we have a closed rule for advancing these bills.

The gentleman talks about the most closed Congress was the 115th Congress. I will wait and see if the gentleman's side in leading Congress' score is better than the 115th Congress was. It would be interesting to keep that scorecard.

In the past, I have supported bills like these, especially appropriations bills for agriculture, transportation, housing, and urban development.

On the whole, the agriculture bill has priorities that are critical to my district, including the farm safety net, rural broadband, food safety, and more. However, I can't support these bills because they are offered in bad faith. It is a charade. Let's be honest. It is simply a charade. It is not a serious attempt to fund agriculture or any other priorities in my district or in this country.

It is, in fact, distract and delay in order to put pressure on, to squeeze the American people to get what you want.

It is madness, I will agree with you. It is madness where we are going right now because 17,000 people with criminal convictions were stopped at the United States southern border last year.

That doesn't count the ones we didn't catch because they came in in other ways. Yet, somehow, we want to ignore that rather than worry about our border security. Without borders, without secure borders, we are not a country.

The President, the administration offered a package. My colleague on the

other side of the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN, I want him to see this letter. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, you have it. It talks about the priorities of the administration.

It talks about funding, yes, for a wall or barrier for 234 miles. Only 234 miles, not the 2,000 miles suddenly people are talking about, which is a top 10 priority of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in order to funnel people crossing the border to entry points.

It talks about additional immigration judges. It provides funding for additional border patrol. It provides funding for infrastructure at the borders—many things the other side of the aisle was talking about. So why is it, that rather than going to the White House, closing the door, and not coming out until you come up with an answer, there is a press conference being held in the Rayburn Reception Room where once more we talk about, well, we are not doing anything.

If you want to reopen the government, go to the White House, close the door, and don't come back here until we have a deal. A deal requires all parties. These bills will not be taken up in the Senate. The President said he will veto them.

Negotiation, I spent 35 years in private business, and negotiation means you never get everything you want, but you walk away where all parties say: We could have gotten a little more. But you solve the problem rather than put people at risk.

We are putting people at risk in this country. People won't get paid Friday. You are right. We are also putting the American people at risk by not securing our border. We have kicked that can down the road my entire time I have been here, 2 years now, and long before that.

One final point: We know that Democrats previously have supported funding for border walls, border security, and a border fence. Call it what you want.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, so why is it now we can't simply agree that we need to do more to secure our border along the lines of this, including 234 miles of wall, only because the President's name is on it?

Come on, let's solve the problem. Let's be adults here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning I met Chrissy, an air traffic controller from Ventura, California. Her job is to ensure the safety and efficiency of air travel, but the Trump shutdown has caused chaos. Air traffic controllers will not receive their paychecks on Friday. The FAA support staff has been furloughed, and the students in the air traffic control

academy have been sent home. Because of this, air traffic controllers like her are being forced to slow down everything in order to ensure the same level of air safety.

But it is not just Chrissy's work that is being impacted. She and her husband, who is also an air traffic controller, lost their home in the Thomas fire, and now, as they try to rebuild their home and their lives, Trump is forcing them to do it without a paycheck.

How can we do this to our workers? Last night, Trump tried to make his case to the Nation. What we heard was a lot of xenophobia and division. What we didn't hear was any urgent threat that would justify a shutdown right now over a wall that would be built in the future.

That is why we are bringing up today's bills to reopen government. If Trump wants to negotiate over border security, he should show concern for workers like Chrissy and sign these bills. Nineteen days into the shutdown, Trump is making the American people suffer for the sake of his ego.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and join us in passing these bills to reopen government functions that have nothing to do with Trump's demand for a wall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded not to use personalities when referring to the President of the United States.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify the body, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to report modified open rules for each bill before us today: H.R. 264, H.R. 265, H.R. 266, and H.R. 267. The rule would include a preprinting requirement.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us today are simply nothing more than Senate products. House Democrats would rather try to win political points against the Senate than allow this House to do its job. Again, the Senate hasn't indicated they will take up these measures, and the President has not agreed to sign these measures. There is time to do this the right way.

In 2011, right after Republicans took the majority control of the House, the government was operating under a continuing resolution, and we considered a bill on the floor to fund the entire Federal Government, and we did it under one open rule with just a preprinting requirement.

There were a total of 66 hours of floor debate from the afternoon of February 15, 2011, to the early hours of February 19, including one stretch of debate that lasted 42 hours.

I do understand what an enormous undertaking it would be, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't and can't take the time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extra-

neous 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. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) left the floor, but I know Mr. NEWHOUSE is still here, and I am complimented by the fact that they quote me so much. But I want to quote me, too, because I am going through what I have said about open rules and about the way this House should be run.

On November 14 on the floor I said:

And I am not suggesting that every rule needs to be an open rule or that there is never a time for a closed rule, but there is never a time for more than 100 closed rules. There is no justification for that.

That is me. And on April 24, I said:

I am under no illusion that every bill has to be an open rule; although it would be nice to have at least one symbolic open rule before the year is out.

On April 13, I said:

I can't promise that every rule is going to be an open rule, but I can say that there would be a greater attempt to try to accommodate Members.

On September 2, I said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that everything that the House considers should be under an open rule. There are times when a closed rule might be necessary. But more than 100 closed rules? There is no justification for that.

So I think I am being pretty consistent here, because I have actually voted for closed rules on this floor that have been suggested in times of emergency. I voted for one to actually bring a continuing resolution to the floor so that we wouldn't have to deal with the mess that we are in right now.

So in times of emergency, in times of life or death, yes, there are justifications for a closed rule, and this is one of them because this is last year's work. This is what my friends on the other side left us with, unfinished business from last year. Not only unfinished business, but they allowed the President to shut the government down.

So hundreds of thousands of American workers are in a panic right now because last year's majority, my Republican friends, did not do their job.

This is ridiculous. We ought to figure out a way to have our discussions without shutting the government down. This is not the way you are supposed to run government. And so we are offering a solution here so that we can reopen the government and continue our conversations about whatever you want.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said we should split the difference on the border wall.

Why are we splitting the difference? Why are we assuming the cost of a border wall when the President said that Mexico was going to pay for it, a border wall that most experts say is useless and ridiculous and that that money could be better spent on other ways of enforcing border security?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, breaking news to the American people: all the other body has to do, the Senate, is to take the bills passed by the Democratic majority in the House and the government will open in minutes, simply with the signature of the President of the United States and the opportunity to work on the kind of barrier that is appropriate for the border, a State of which I come from, Texas, a border State, and have deep knowledge about which borders work and which don't. Then the government could open—breaking news.

It is shameful for my Republican colleagues to come to the floor of the House and not acknowledge that the simple problem is with the White House.

We are not interested in not talking about border security. Democrats have been working on border security for decades and have been successful in the funding to provide barriers that are there now, that I just saw in the last week, myself, at the border, as I have done on many occasions, and simply acknowledging that we helped build up the Border Patrol agency. We as Democrats have built up Customs and Border Protection.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that, when you take \$5.7 billion out of the budget, you are not writing a paper check. What it means is that you will cut into Border Patrol agents; you will cut into Customs and Border Protection; you will cut into dollars for education; and you will cut into dollars for healthcare.

How shameful, again, it is for the President to use the opioid crisis that we have been working on well for many, many years. Does he understand that most drugs come through a tunnel and, as well, through legal points of entry? They are not coming across with families—women and children.

Does he understand, when he asks for \$5.7 billion, that we need \$78 billion to deal with the opioid crisis throughout America, where 115 people die every day? That is money that could be used for providing treatment, providing reverse drugs, and providing access to hospitals and medical care.

We should not be distorting facts to alter the thinking of the American people on untruths. We simply need to say, yes, barriers are appropriate where they can be placed. But this administration is wrong. It pains my heart as a senior member on the Homeland Security Committee to acknowledge that he is holding the American people hostage.

Let me say to all the Federal workers: We thank you.

On my way back to Washington, I stopped to talk to TSA, transportation security agents. They are on the front lines of securing this Nation.

Thank you.

They are on the front lines, along with air traffic controllers. Aviation is still one of the greatest targets for terrorism.

What does this President do? He blocks them from getting paid this very Friday.

Open the government now.

To the other body: Put our bills on the floor of the Senate. Vote and send it to the White House.

I dare the White House to reject the pain of the American people and refuse to open this government so that mothers can have childcare, so that TSA agents can be able to pay their mortgage, so that agricultural workers can continue doing rural development and food stamps, which are going to end in a couple of weeks.

We can't fool around like this anymore. All this chitter-chatter on the other side is nothing but chitter-chatter saying nothing, absolutely nothing.

Open the government, to the White House, and open it now.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was amused—and I actually mean this in very good spirit—when my friend mentioned how frequently he had been quoted in today's debate, and I have to say I consider my friend one of the great debaters in this Chamber, and I enjoy hearing him quoted on the floor of the House. So I accept that, and I hope the gentleman knows it was a compliment to him in many ways.

I also want to tell him—and I mean this very seriously—I take him at his word. I don't have any doubt my friend wants to operate differently than we have operated in the past and that he wants this institution to be more open to inclusion of various points of view and very sincere debate, and I pledge to my friend I will work with him in that endeavor.

Now, it is hard to resist pointing out the gentleman's first six bills have all been under closed rules. I suspect we will continue to point that out until we have an opportunity to say to my good friend—and I think we will in the very near future—"Congratulations, you are following through on the things that you said." Again, I know my friend will do that at what he considers and the majority considers the appropriate time.

We have a lot of discussion, Mr. Speaker, about who did and didn't do their jobs in the last Congress. I would tell you, in my view, that the House did its job. It passed its bills. It sent to the Senate a product that the President would sign.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell you, you are doing your job here, as well, right now in the majority. You passed bills

last week. You sent them over to the United States Senate.

In our case, the minority in the Senate blocked consideration of our bills. Had those bills been placed on the floor, we wouldn't be here today. They would have all passed. They had majority support in the Senate; they had a President willing to sign them; and they had already passed the House.

The only reason why we are here today is because the Democratic minority in the Senate manipulated the rules of the Senate in such a way that they could stop action. I suspect we all have had frustration with that as House Members in the past. I think we will again in the future.

I also want to reflect with my friends, and I draw this conclusion not so much out of their actions, but actions that my own party, from time to time, has committed, and I suspect I will say this to this Chamber many times: Pursuit of absolute victory in domestic political disputes is always a mistake. It always leaves a divided country and an embittered opponent, and you will rue the day when you pursue it. We have certainly done that, Mr. Speaker, on my side of the aisle.

I think that, to some degree, though, is what is going on today. Sooner or later—and we are going to live with a Republican Senate for the next 2 years and a Republican President for the next 2 years—my friends in the majority will have to decide whether they want to govern or debate, because that is all we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, you are not the opposition party anymore. You are the majority party, and you have every right to pursue your agenda. But if you really want to govern, if you really want to get something done, in the end, you are going to have to work with the Republican Senate, and you are going to have to work with the Republican President.

We learned that hard reality when we were in the majority but dealing with a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President in 2011 through 2014. I hope my friends learn the lesson more quickly and become wiser than we were. I hope they benefit from our experience.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying measure. The majority today is putting forward a closed rule to bring up four appropriations bills, each of which the House has already passed last week.

But, unfortunately, each of these bills is not a product of the House of Representatives. These bills are Senate products that do not reflect any House input. What is worse, they do not solve the fundamental problem of border security, and they do not represent a serious effort to reopen the government.

Since the Senate will not pass these bills and the President will not sign them, all we are accomplishing here today is spinning our wheels. The majority would be better served to undertake serious negotiations with the President and the Senate over the need

for border security and to find a way out of the crisis of their own making rather than hoping that something will be different this time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) that I think he is one of the best Members of this Chamber. I admire him, and I think that he is absolutely right when he says that the Appropriations Committee did its work, and that goes for Republicans and Democrats. People worked together, and they moved appropriations bills forward. So I find no fault with and I have no blame for the appropriators.

What I do blame is his leadership that, at the last minute, when the President decided to have a temper tantrum and threatened to shut the government down, the Republican leadership was complicit, basically, and said: We will go along with this. And here we are.

By the way, I can't wait to get this over with so we can get on to other business. By the way, we are going to bring up the disaster appropriations bill next week. We have a notice out asking for amendments. I think the deadline is on Friday at noon. I can't recall the last time a disaster appropriations bill ever solicited amendments. We are going to do that. But I appreciate his words.

Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency. We are now dealing with a major crisis in this country, and it is not just Federal workers. USA Today reported last week: "Government shutdown 2019: Homebuyers with USDA mortgages can't close on house sales."

Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN 2019: HOMEBUYERS WITH USDA MORTGAGES CAN'T CLOSE ON HOUSE SALES

[From USA Today, Jan. 3, 2019]

(By Janna Herron)

Jordan and Tracey Smith of Madison, Maine, were scheduled to close on their first home on Friday. But the government shutdown has gotten in the way.

The couple needs the U.S. Department of Agriculture to help finalize their mortgage that is guaranteed by the agency. But the USDA's operations have been closed for 13 days, so the couple and their five children remain in limbo.

"We're living out of boxes. We're paying our landlord on a week-to-week basis, but he has people waiting to move in," says Jordan Smith, 32. "We just want to move and get this process over with."

It's the same for other borrowers who depend on the USDA. The department provides—through private lenders—mortgages with no down payment requirements and low interest rates and fees to rural and suburban homebuyers. It's a small program, helping just over 140,000 people to buy a home in 2017, but is considered one of the best options around if you're eligible.

"We just can't close a USDA loan without a commitment letter from them. "Your loan

is at a standstill," says Pava Leyrer, the chief operating officer of Northern Mortgage Services in Grandville, Michigan. Leyrer's company is an approved USDA lender.

Leyrer is telling her affected clients to call their representatives. Otherwise, they may ultimately need to switch into a different loan. "How long will the seller wait, especially if the sales contract expires?" she says.

WAITING FOR REPAIR MONEY

In other cases, those who already have a USDA mortgage are running into trouble. Jenneffer Azcuy, a homeowner in Lynn Haven, Florida, with a USDA mortgage, is waiting to get the insurance money she needs to repair her house after it was damaged by Hurricane Michael in October.

"Since my insurance repair check is over \$7,500, the USDA controls the disbursement of funds," Azcuy says "But the money is tied up."

On mortgages it guarantees, the USDA requires that it oversees how insurance claims funds are used to make sure they are spent properly. When insured losses exceed \$7,500, the agency requires the funds to be deposited into an escrow account it controls.

Azcuy has a contractor lined up to repair her leaky roof, replace a fence, and fix the gutters and outside doors. She has called the USDA for help but can't leave messages because the voicemail is full.

"It's ridiculous. This town is devastated as it is from the hurricane," she says.

WHAT ABOUT OTHER MORTGAGES?

The other mortgages backed by the government are unaffected so far by the shutdown. Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and the Veterans Administration—which all back home loans—are running as normal.

The Federal Housing Administration, which guarantees mortgages popular among first-time homebuyers, is operating with a smaller staff because of the shutdown but is still approving loans.

"You can get some answers," Leyrer says, but adds: "They are slower to respond, and it takes longer to get through on the phone because of limited staff."

Lenders are also working around other shutdown-induced hiccups.

For instance, they can't verify a person's tax information with the Internal Revenue Service, which has limited services. As a result, many lenders are still approving those loans conditionally and will confirm the information later when the IRS reopens, says John Stearns, a loan originator with American Fidelity Mortgage Services in Mequon, Wisconsin.

"If there is a problem, then I have to figure it out then," Stearns says.

ON CAPITOL HILL

Azcuy and the Smiths hope the new House of Representatives convening on Thursday can end the shutdown. Democratic House leaders have scheduled votes on a package of bills to reopen the federal government and provide more time for Congress to negotiate a border funding deal with the White House. Until then, they wait.

"My wife and I support Donald Trump. We agree with border security," Jordan Smith says. "But he has to look and see that this is affecting other people's lives."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the article reports on the situation of Jordan and Tracey Smith of Madison, Maine, and their five children. They were scheduled to close on their very first home last Friday, but this ridiculous Trump shutdown ruined that. They need the Department of Agriculture to finalize their mortgage, but USDA has been closed for weeks.

Here is what Mr. Smith said: "We're living out of boxes. "We're paying our landlord on a week-to-week basis, but he has people waiting to move in."

So lives are being thrown into turmoil, and we don't have a lot of time to just carry on these conversations and endless debates. This is a time for action.

This is the first time a prior Congress ended in a government shutdown. It is fitting. It is almost like an exclamation point to the President's first 2 years in office.

But it is a new Congress, and we are ready to responsibly clean up this mess and do what the last Congress could not do. We are offering an extremely reasonable solution to this unnecessary government shutdown. The underlying legislation is virtually identical to the four appropriations bills that already passed the Senate, 92-6.

Compare that to what the prior Republican majority put forward in the waning days of last Congress. They passed a partisan funding bill with billions of dollars for the President's wall, legislation they knew Democrats would never support and that the Senate would never pass. Then they left town. They refused to even recognize me when I tried again and again to bring up a bipartisan bill to end the shutdown.

800,000 workers stopped receiving paychecks. That includes, by the way, thousands of border and law enforcement officers, more than 41,000 Federal law enforcement officers, people like FBI agents and DEA agents, nearly 54,000 Customs and Border Patrol agents and Customs officers, and almost 90 percent of the Department of Homeland Security employees.

This Trump shutdown is an embarrassment. We owe our Federal employees and all Americans better than this. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this rule and the previous question and join with us in supporting these underlying bipartisan funding bills. This is another chance for us to do the right thing. Let's take it and bring an end to this unnecessary and painful Trump shutdown.

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

Strike sections 1 and 2 and insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with

clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 2. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 264, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 265) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 265, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 266) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of

the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 4. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 266, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 267) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of any bill referred to in sections 1 through 4 of this resolution.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous

question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 226, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 195, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—231

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Haaland	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hayes	Peters
Beyer	Heck	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blumenauer	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Pressley
Brindisi	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cardenas	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Case	Keating	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Ciциlline	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kim	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Clyburn	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lawrence	Shalala
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sires
Craig	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Crist	Levin (MI)	Smith (WA)
Crow	Lewis	Soto
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Spanberger
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Cunningham	Loebback	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Stevens
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Davis, Danny K.	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
Dean	Lujan	Takano
DeGette	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Malinowski	Titus
Delgado	Maloney,	Tlaib
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Matsui	Torres Small
Dingell	McAdams	(NM)
Doggett	McBath	Trahan
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Trone
Engel	McEachin	Underwood
Escobar	McGovern	Van Drew
Eshoo	McNerney	Vargas
Españlat	Meeks	Veasey
Evans	Meng	Vela
Finkenauer	Moore	Velázquez
Fletcher	Morelle	Visclosky
Foster	Moulton	Wasserman
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Schultz
Gabbard	Murphy	Waters
Gallego	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wild
Golden	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
	Ocasio-Cortez	

NAYS—195

Abraham	Amash	Arrington
Aderholt	Amodei	Babin
Allen	Armstrong	Bacon

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

NOT VOTING—7

Buck	Hastings	Mast
DeFazio	Jones	
Frankel	Kelly (PA)	

□ 1352

Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. FORTENBERRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. SANCHEZ, JACKSON LEE, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. BEYER 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 (Mr. WELCH). 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. 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 231, nays 195, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—231

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

NAYS—195

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

DesJarlais Joyce (PA) Rogers (KY)
 Diaz-Balart Katko Rooney (FL)
 Duffy Kelly (MS) Rose, John W.
 Duncan King (IA) Rouzer
 Dunn King (NY) Roy
 Emmer Kinzinger Rutherford
 Estes Kustoff (TN) Scalise
 Ferguson LaHood Schweikert
 Fitzpatrick LaMalfa Scott, Austin
 Fleischmann Lamborn Sensenbrenner
 Flores Latta Shimkus
 Fortenberry Lesko Simpson
 Foxx (NC) Long Smith (MO)
 Fulcher Loudermilk Smith (NE)
 Gaetz Lucas Smith (NJ)
 Gallagher Luetkemeyer Smucker
 Gianforte Marchant Spano
 Gibbs Marino Stauber
 Gohmert Marshall Stefanik
 Gonzalez (OH) Massie Steil
 Gooden McCarthy Steube
 Gosar McCaul Stewart
 Granger McClintock Stivers
 Graves (GA) McHenry Taylor
 Graves (LA) McKinley Thompson (PA)
 Graves (MO) Meadows Thornberry
 Green (TN) Meuser Timmons
 Griffith Miller Tipton
 Guthrie Mitchell Turner
 Hagedorn Moolenaar Upton
 Harris Guthrie Mooney (WV) Wagner
 Hartzler Mullin Walberg
 Hern, Kevin Newhouse Walden
 Herrera Beutler Olson Walker
 Hice (GA) Palazzo Walorski
 Higgins (LA) Palmer Waltz
 Hill (AR) Pence Watkins
 Holding Perry Weber (TX)
 Hollingsworth Posey Webster (FL)
 Hudson Ratcliffe Wenstrup
 Huizenga Reed Westerman
 Hunter Reschenthaler Williams
 Hurd (TX) Rice (SC) Wilson (SC)
 Johnson (LA) Riggelman Wittman
 Johnson (OH) Roby Womack
 Johnson (SD) Rodgers (WA) Woodall
 Jordan Roe, David P. Wright
 Joyce (OH) Rogers (AL) Yoho
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings Mast
 Jones
 Kelly (PA)

□ 1403

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.

CLARITY ON SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN CATEGORY MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 226) to amend the Small Business Act to include best in class designations in the annual report on small business goals prepared by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 11, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—414

Abraham DelBene Keating
 Adams Delgado Kelly (IL)
 Aderholt Demings Kelly (MS)
 Aguilera DeSaulnier Kennedy
 Allen DesJarlais Khanna
 Allred Deutch Kildee
 Amodei Diaz-Balart Kilmer
 Armstrong Armstrong Dingell
 Arrington Arrington Doggett
 Axne Doyle, Michael
 Babin F. King (NY)
 Bacon Kirkpatrick Kinzinger
 Baird Duncan Krishnamoorthi
 Balderson Dunn Kuster (NH)
 Banks Emmer Kustoff (TN)
 Barr Engel LaHood
 Barragán Escobar LaMalfa
 Bass Eshoo Lamb
 Beatty Espallat Lamborn
 Bera Estes Langevin
 Bergman Evans Larsen (WA)
 Beyer Ferguson Larson (CT)
 Bilirakis Finkenauer Latta
 Bishop (GA) Fitzpatrick Lawrence
 Bishop (UT) Fleischmann Lawson (FL)
 Blumenauer Fletcher Lee (CA)
 Blunt Rochester Flores Lee (NV)
 Bonamici Fortenberry Lesko
 Bost Foster Levin (CA)
 Boyle, Brendan Foxx (NC) Levin (MI)
 F. Fudge Lewis
 Brady Fulcher Lieu, Ted
 Brindisi Gabbard Lipinski
 Brooks (IN) Gallagher Loeb sack
 Brown (MD) Gallego Lofgren
 Brownley (CA) Garamendi Long
 Buchanan Garcia (IL) Loudermilk
 Bucshon Garcia (TX) Lowenthal
 Budd Gianforte Lowey
 Burchett Gibbs Lucas
 Burgess Golden Luetkemeyer
 Bustos Gomez Luján
 Butterfield Gonzalez (OH) Luria
 Byrne Gonzalez (TX) Lynch
 Calvert Gooden Malinowski
 Carbajal Gottheimer Maloney,
 Cárdenas Granger Carolyn B.
 Carson (IN) Graves (GA) Maloney, Sean
 Carter (GA) Graves (LA) Marchant
 Carter (TX) Graves (MO) Marino
 Cartwright Green (TN) Marshall
 Case Green (TX) Massie
 Casten (IL) Griffith Matsui
 Castor (FL) Grijalva McAdams
 Castro (TX) Grothman McEachin
 Chabot Guest McCarthy
 Cheney Guthrie McCaul
 Chu, Judy Haaland McClintock
 Cicilline Hagedorn McCollum
 Cisneros Harder (CA) McEachin
 Clark (MA) Harris McGovern
 Clarke (NY) Hartzler McHenry
 Clay Hayes McKinley
 Cleaver Heck McNeerney
 Cloud Hern, Kevin Meadows
 Clyburn Herrera Beutler Meeks
 Cohen Hice (GA) Meng
 Cole Higgins (LA) Meuser
 Collins (GA) Higgins (NY) Miller
 Collins (NY) Hill (AR) Mitchell
 Comer Hill (CA) Moolenaar
 Conaway Himes Mooney (WV)
 Connolly Holding Moore
 Cook Hollingsworth Morelle
 Cooper Horn, Kendra S. Moulton
 Correa Horsford Mucarsel-Powell
 Costa Houlihan Mullin
 Courtney Hoyer Murphy
 Cox (CA) Hudson Nadler
 Craig Huffman Napolitano
 Crawford Huizenga Neal
 Crenshaw Hunter Neguse
 Crist Hurd (TX) Newhouse
 Crow Jackson Lee Norcross
 Cuellar Jayapal Norman
 Cummings Jeffries Nunes
 Cunningham Johnson (GA) O'Halleran
 Curtis Johnson (LA) Ocasio-Cortez
 Davids (KS) Johnson (OH) Olson
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (SD) Omar
 Davis (CA) Johnson (TX) Palazzo
 Davis, Danny K. Jordan Pallone
 Davis, Rodney Joyce (OH) Palmer
 Dean Joyce (PA) Panetta
 DeGette Kaptur Pappas
 DeLauro Katko Pascarell

Payne	Schrader	Torres (CA)
Pence	Schrier	Torres Small
Perlmutter	Schweikert	(NM)
Perry	Scott (VA)	Trahan
Peters	Scott, Austin	Trone
Peterson	Scott, David	Turner
Phillips	Sensenbrenner	Underwood
Pingree	Serrano	Upton
Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Van Drew
Porter	Shalala	Vargas
Posey	Sherman	Veasey
Pressley	Sherrill	Vela
Price (NC)	Shimkus	Velázquez
Quigley	Simpson	Visclosky
Raskin	Sires	Wagner
Ratcliffe	Slotkin	Walberg
Reed	Smith (MO)	Walden
Reschenthaler	Smith (NE)	Walker
Rice (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Smith (WA)	Waltz
Richmond	Smucker	Wasserman
Riggleman	Soto	Schultz
Roby	Spanberger	Waters
Rodgers (WA)	Speier	Watkins
Roe, David P.	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Rogers (AL)	Staubert	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Stefanik	Webster (FL)
Rose (NY)	Steil	Welch
Rose, John W.	Stevens	Wenstrup
Rouda	Stewart	Westerman
Rouzer	Stivers	Wexton
Roybal-Allard	Suozzi	Wild
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Williams
Ruppersberger	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Rush	Taylor	Wilson (SC)
Rutherford	Thompson (CA)	Wittman
Ryan	Thompson (MS)	Womack
Sánchez	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Sarbanes	Thornberry	Wright
Scalise	Timmons	Yarmuth
Scanlon	Tipton	Yoho
Schakowsky	Titus	Young
Schiff	Tlaib	Zeldin
Schneider	Tonko	

NAYS—11

Amash	Gaetz	Roy
Biggs	Gohmert	Spano
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Steube
Cline	King (IA)	

NOT VOTING—8

Buck	Hastings	Mast
DeFazio	Jones	Rooney (FL)
Frankel	Kelly (PA)	

□ 1413

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 32

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Marchant.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 28, I call up the bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 28, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 264

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Freedman's Bank Building; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business; executive direction program activities; international affairs and economic policy activities; domestic finance and tax policy activities, including technical assistance to Puerto Rico; and Treasury-wide management policies and programs activities, \$208,751,000: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading—

(1) not to exceed \$700,000 is for official reception and representation expenses, of which necessary amounts shall be available for expenses to support activities of the Financial Action Task Force, and not to exceed \$350,000 shall be for other official reception and representation expenses;

(2) not to exceed \$258,000 is for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate; and

(3) not to exceed \$24,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, for—

(A) the Treasury-wide Financial Statement Audit and Internal Control Program;

(B) information technology modernization requirements;

(C) the audit, oversight, and administration of the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund;

(D) the development and implementation of programs within the Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Compliance Policy, including entering into cooperative agreements;

(E) operations and maintenance of facilities; and

(F) international operations.

OFFICE OF TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the necessary expenses of the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence to safeguard the financial system against illicit use and to combat rogue nations, terrorist

facilitators, weapons of mass destruction proliferators, money launderers, drug kingpins, and other national security threats, \$159,000,000: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading: (1) up to \$33,500,000 may be transferred to the Departmental Offices Salaries and Expenses appropriation and shall be available for administrative support to the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence; and (2) up to \$10,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than \$1,000,000 shall be used to support and augment new and ongoing investigations into the illicit trade of synthetic opioids, particularly fentanyl and its analogues, originating from the People's Republic of China: *Provided further*, That not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration and the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate, shall submit a comprehensive report (which shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex) summarizing efforts by actors in the People's Republic of China to subvert United States laws and to supply illicit synthetic opioids to persons in the United States, including up-to-date estimates of the scale of illicit synthetic opioids flows from the People's Republic of China, to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT

For salaries and expenses for enhanced cybersecurity for systems operated by the Department of the Treasury, \$25,208,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021: *Provided*, That such funds shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts made available to the Treasury offices and bureaus for cybersecurity: *Provided further*, That the Chief Information Officer of the individual offices and bureaus shall submit a spend plan for each investment to the Treasury Chief Information Officer for approval: *Provided further*, That the submitted spend plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Treasury Chief Information Officer prior to the obligation of funds under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading \$1,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses for the Treasury Chief Information Officer to provide oversight of the investments made under this heading: *Provided further*, That such funds shall supplement and not supplant any other amounts made available to the Treasury Chief Information Officer.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE SYSTEMS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENTS PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services and for repairs and renovations to buildings owned by the Department of the Treasury, \$4,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021: *Provided*, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to support or supplement "Internal Revenue Service, Operations Support"

or “Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization”.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$37,044,000, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury; of which up to \$2,800,000 to remain available until September 30, 2020, shall be for audits and investigations conducted pursuant to section 1608 of the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (33 U.S.C. 1321 note); and of which not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX
ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Inspector General for Tax Administration; \$169,634,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020; of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be available for official travel expenses; of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration; and of which not to exceed \$1,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE
TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Special Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-343), \$17,500,000.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and training expenses of non-Federal and foreign government personnel to attend meetings and training concerned with domestic and foreign financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$117,800,000, of which not to exceed \$34,335,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021.

BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of operations of the Bureau of the Fiscal Service, \$338,280,000; of which not to exceed \$4,210,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, is for information systems modernization initiatives; and of which \$5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

In addition, \$165,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to reimburse administrative and personnel expenses for financial management of the Fund, as authorized by section 1012 of Public Law 101-380.

ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX AND TRADE
BUREAU

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of carrying out section 1111 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$111,439,000; of which not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed \$50,000 for cooperative research and development programs for laboratory services; and provision of laboratory assistance to State and local agencies with or without reimbursement: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be for the costs of accelerating the processing of formula and label applications: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

UNITED STATES MINT

UNITED STATES MINT PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND

Pursuant to section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, the United States Mint is provided funding through the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund for costs associated with the production of circulating coins, numismatic coins, and protective services, including both operating expenses and capital investments: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of new liabilities and obligations incurred during fiscal year 2019 under such section 5136 for circulating coinage and protective service capital investments of the United States Mint shall not exceed \$30,000,000.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL
INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvements Act of 1994 (subtitle A of title I of Public Law 103-325), including services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for EX-3, \$250,000,000. Of the amount appropriated under this heading—

(1) not less than \$182,000,000, notwithstanding section 108(e) of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(e)) with regard to Small and/or Emerging Community Development Financial Institutions Assistance awards, is available until September 30, 2020, for financial assistance and technical assistance under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 108(a)(1), respectively, of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(a)(1)(A) and (B)), of which up to \$2,680,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans: *Provided*, That the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$25,000,000;

(2) not less than \$16,000,000, notwithstanding section 108(e) of Public Law 103-325 (12 U.S.C. 4707(e)), is available until September 30, 2020, for financial assistance, technical assistance, training, and outreach programs designed to benefit Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native communities and provided primarily through qualified community development lender organizations with experience and expertise in community development banking and lending in Indian country, Native American organizations, tribes and tribal organizations, and other suitable providers;

(3) not less than \$25,000,000 is available until September 30, 2020, for the Bank Enterprise Award program;

(4) up to \$27,000,000 is available until September 30, 2019, for administrative expenses, including administration of CDFI fund pro-

grams and the New Markets Tax Credit Program, of which not less than \$1,000,000 is for development of tools to better assess and inform CDFI investment performance, and up to \$300,000 is for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program; and

(5) during fiscal year 2019, none of the funds available under this heading are available for the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of commitments to guarantee bonds and notes under section 114A of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4713a): *Provided*, That commitments to guarantee bonds and notes under such section 114A shall not exceed \$500,000,000: *Provided further*, That such section 114A shall remain in effect until December 31, 2019: *Provided further*, That of the funds awarded under this heading, not less than 10 percent shall be used for awards that support investments that serve populations living in persistent poverty counties: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section, the term “persistent poverty counties” means any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses and the 2011–2015 5-year data series available from the American Community Survey of the Census Bureau.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
TAXPAYER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to provide taxpayer services, including pre-filing assistance and education, filing and account services, taxpayer advocacy services, and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, \$2,506,554,000, of which not less than \$9,890,000 shall be for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program, of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be available for low-income taxpayer clinic grants, of which not less than \$20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, shall be available for a Community Volunteer Income Tax Assistance matching grants program for tax return preparation assistance, and of which not less than \$206,000,000 shall be available for operating expenses of the Taxpayer Advocate Service: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available for the Taxpayer Advocate Service, not less than \$5,500,000 shall be for identity theft and refund fraud casework.

ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for tax enforcement activities of the Internal Revenue Service to determine and collect owed taxes, to provide legal and litigation support, to conduct criminal investigations, to enforce criminal statutes related to violations of internal revenue laws and other financial crimes, to purchase and hire passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)), and to provide other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, \$4,860,000,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, and of which not less than \$60,257,000 shall be for the Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement program.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to support taxpayer services and enforcement programs, including rent payments; facilities services; printing; postage; physical security; headquarters and other IRS-wide administration activities; research and statistics of income; telecommunications; information technology development, enhancement, operations, maintenance, and security; the hire of passenger

motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); the operations of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board; and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; \$3,709,000,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall remain available until expended for acquisition of equipment and construction, repair and renovation of facilities; of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021, for research; of which not to exceed \$20,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Internal Revenue Service shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General of the United States detailing the cost and schedule performance for its major information technology investments, including the purpose and life-cycle stages of the investments; the reasons for any cost and schedule variances; the risks of such investments and strategies the Internal Revenue Service is using to mitigate such risks; and the expected developmental milestones to be achieved and costs to be incurred in the next quarter: *Provided further*, That the Internal Revenue Service shall include, in its budget justification for fiscal year 2020, a summary of cost and schedule performance information for its major information technology systems.

BUSINESS SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service's business systems modernization program, \$110,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including related Internal Revenue Service labor costs, and contractual costs associated with operations authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Internal Revenue Service shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the Comptroller General of the United States detailing the cost and schedule performance for major information technology investments, including the purposes and life-cycle stages of the investments; the reasons for any cost and schedule variances; the risks of such investments and the strategies the Internal Revenue Service is using to mitigate such risks; and the expected developmental milestones to be achieved and costs to be incurred in the next quarter.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to any other Internal Revenue Service appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 102. The Internal Revenue Service shall maintain an employee training program, which shall include the following topics: taxpayers' rights, dealing courteously with taxpayers, cross-cultural relations, ethics, and the impartial application of tax law.

SEC. 103. The Internal Revenue Service shall institute and enforce policies and procedures that will safeguard the confidentiality of taxpayer information and protect taxpayers against identity theft.

SEC. 104. Funds made available by this or any other Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be available for improved facilities

and increased staffing to provide sufficient and effective 1-800 help line service for taxpayers. The Commissioner shall continue to make improvements to the Internal Revenue Service 1-800 help line service a priority and allocate resources necessary to enhance the response time to taxpayer communications, particularly with regard to victims of tax-related crimes.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available to the Internal Revenue Service by this Act may be used to make a video unless the Service-Wide Video Editorial Board determines in advance that making the video is appropriate, taking into account the cost, topic, tone, and purpose of the video.

SEC. 106. The Internal Revenue Service shall issue a notice of confirmation of any address change relating to an employer making employment tax payments, and such notice shall be sent to both the employer's former and new address and an officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service shall give special consideration to an offer-in-compromise from a taxpayer who has been the victim of fraud by a third party payroll tax preparer.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to target citizens of the United States for exercising any right guaranteed under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to target groups for regulatory scrutiny based on their ideological beliefs.

SEC. 109. None of funds made available by this Act to the Internal Revenue Service shall be obligated or expended on conferences that do not adhere to the procedures, verification processes, documentation requirements, and policies issued by the Chief Financial Officer, Human Capital Office, and Agency-Wide Shared Services as a result of the recommendations in the report published on May 31, 2013, by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration entitled "Review of the August 2010 Small Business/Self-Employed Division's Conference in Anaheim, California" (Reference Number 2013-10-037).

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be obligated or expended—

(1) to make a payment to any employee under a bonus, award, or recognition program; or

(2) under any hiring or personnel selection process with respect to re-hiring a former employee, unless such program or process takes into account the conduct and Federal tax compliance of such employee or former employee.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to confidentiality and disclosure of returns and return information).

SEC. 112. Except to the extent provided in section 6014, 6020, or 6201(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, no funds in this or any other Act shall be available to the Secretary of the Treasury to provide to any person a proposed final return or statement for use by such person to satisfy a filing or reporting requirement under such Code.

SEC. 113. In addition to the amounts otherwise made available in this Act for the Internal Revenue Service, \$77,000,000, to be available until September 30, 2020, shall be transferred by the Commissioner to the "Taxpayer Services", "Enforcement", or "Operations Support" accounts of the Internal Revenue Service for an additional amount to be used solely for carrying out Public Law 115-97: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be available until the Commissioner submits to

the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spending plan for such funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 114. Appropriations to the Department of the Treasury in this Act shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning; purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used overseas for the current fiscal year; entering into contracts with the Department of State for the furnishing of health and medical services to employees and their dependents serving in foreign countries; and services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 115. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriations in this title made available under the headings "Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses", "Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence", "Office of Inspector General", "Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program", "Financial Crimes Enforcement Network", "Bureau of the Fiscal Service", and "Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau" may be transferred between such appropriations upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That no transfer under this section may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 116. Not to exceed 2 percent of any appropriation made available in this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be transferred to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration's appropriation upon the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any such appropriation by more than 2 percent.

SEC. 117. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise available to the Department of the Treasury or the Bureau of Engraving and Printing may be used to redesign the \$1 Federal Reserve note.

SEC. 118. The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer funds from the "Bureau of the Fiscal Service—Salaries and Expenses" to the Debt Collection Fund as necessary to cover the costs of debt collection: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be reimbursed to such salaries and expenses account from debt collections received in the Debt Collection Fund.

SEC. 119. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used by the United States Mint to construct or operate any museum without the explicit approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Financial Services, and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SEC. 120. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act or source to the Department of the Treasury, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the United States Mint, individually or collectively, may be used to consolidate any or all functions of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the United States Mint without the explicit approval of the House Committee on Financial Services; the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 121. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for the Department of the Treasury's intelligence or intelligence related activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2019 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.

SEC. 122. Not to exceed \$5,000 shall be made available from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing's Industrial Revolving Fund for necessary official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 123. The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a Capital Investment Plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 30 days following the submission of the annual budget submitted by the President: *Provided*, That such Capital Investment Plan shall include capital investment spending from all accounts within the Department of the Treasury, including but not limited to the Department-wide Systems and Capital Investment Programs account, Treasury Franchise Fund account, and the Treasury Forfeiture Fund account: *Provided further*, That such Capital Investment Plan shall include expenditures occurring in previous fiscal years for each capital investment project that has not been fully completed.

SEC. 124. Within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit an itemized report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the amount of total funds charged to each office by the Franchise Fund including the amount charged for each service provided by the Franchise Fund to each office, a detailed description of the services, a detailed explanation of how each charge for each service is calculated, and a description of the role customers have in governing in the Franchise Fund.

SEC. 125. During fiscal year 2019—

(1) none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by the Department of the Treasury, including the Internal Revenue Service, to issue, revise, or finalize any regulation, revenue ruling, or other guidance not limited to a particular taxpayer relating to the standard which is used to determine whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (including the proposed regulations published at 78 Fed. Reg. 71535 (November 29, 2013)); and

(2) the standard and definitions as in effect on January 1, 2010, which are used to make such determinations shall apply after the date of the enactment of this Act for purposes of determining status under section 501(c)(4) of such Code of organizations created on, before, or after such date.

SEC. 126. (a) Not later than 60 days after the end of each quarter, the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall submit reports on their activities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

(b) The reports required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the obligations made during the previous quarter by object class, office, and activity;

(2) the estimated obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year by object class, office, and activity;

(3) the number of full-time equivalents within each office during the previous quarter;

(4) the estimated number of full-time equivalents within each office for the remainder of the fiscal year; and

(5) actions taken to achieve the goals, objectives, and performance measures of each office.

(c) At the request of any such Committees specified in subsection (a), the Office of Financial Stability and the Office of Financial Research shall make officials available to testify on the contents of the reports required under subsection (a).

SEC. 127. Amounts made available under the heading "Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence" shall be available to reimburse the "Departmental Offices—Salaries and Expenses" account for expenses incurred in such account for reception and representation expenses to support activities of the Financial Action Task Force.

SEC. 128. Amounts in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Fund may be used for the acquisition of necessary land for, and construction of, a replacement currency production facility.

SEC. 129. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network and the appropriate divisions of the Department of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on any Geographic Targeting Orders issued since 2016, including—

(1) the type of data collected;

(2) how the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network uses the data;

(3) whether the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network needs more authority to combat money laundering through high-end real estate;

(4) how a record of beneficial ownership would improve and assist law enforcement efforts to investigate and prosecute criminal activity and prevent the use of shell companies to facilitate money laundering, tax evasion, terrorism financing, election fraud, and other illegal activity; and

(5) the feasibility of implementing Geographic Targeting Orders on a permanent basis on all real estate transactions in the United States greater than \$300,000.

This title may be cited as the "Department of the Treasury Appropriations Act, 2019".

TITLE II

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the White House as authorized by law, including not to exceed \$3,850,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 105; subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 105, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; hire of passenger motor vehicles, and travel (not to exceed \$100,000 to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 103); and not to exceed \$19,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be available for allocation within the Executive Office of the President; and for necessary expenses of the Office of Policy Development, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, \$55,000,000.

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, \$13,081,000, to be expended and accounted for as provided by 3 U.S.C. 105, 109, 110, and 112–114.

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

For the reimbursable expenses of the Executive Residence at the White House, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all

reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence shall be made in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, such amount for reimbursable operating expenses shall be the exclusive authority of the Executive Residence to incur obligations and to receive offsetting collections, for such expenses: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall require each person sponsoring a reimbursable political event to pay in advance an amount equal to the estimated cost of the event, and all such advance payments shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall require the national committee of the political party of the President to maintain on deposit \$25,000, to be separately accounted for and available for expenses relating to reimbursable political events sponsored by such committee during such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall ensure that a written notice of any amount owed for a reimbursable operating expense under this paragraph is submitted to the person owing such amount within 60 days after such expense is incurred, and that such amount is collected within 30 days after the submission of such notice: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall charge interest and assess penalties and other charges on any such amount that is not reimbursed within such 30 days, in accordance with the interest and penalty provisions applicable to an outstanding debt on a United States Government claim under 31 U.S.C. 3717: *Provided further*, That each such amount that is reimbursed, and any accompanying interest and charges, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations, by not later than 90 days after the end of the fiscal year covered by this Act, a report setting forth the reimbursable operating expenses of the Executive Residence during the preceding fiscal year, including the total amount of such expenses, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable official and ceremonial events, the amount of such total that consists of reimbursable political events, and the portion of each such amount that has been reimbursed as of the date of the report: *Provided further*, That the Executive Residence shall maintain a system for the tracking of expenses related to reimbursable events within the Executive Residence that includes a standard for the classification of any such expense as political or nonpolitical: *Provided further*, That no provision of this paragraph may be construed to exempt the Executive Residence from any other applicable requirement of subchapter I or II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Executive Residence at the White House pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 105(d), \$750,000, to remain available until expended, for required maintenance, resolution of safety and health issues, and continued preventative maintenance.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Council of Economic Advisers in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.), \$4,187,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND HOMELAND SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Security Council and the Homeland Security

Council, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$11,800,000.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Administration, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 107, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$100,000,000, of which not to exceed \$12,800,000 shall remain available until expended for continued modernization of information resources within the Executive Office of the President.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Management and Budget, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to carry out the provisions of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, and to prepare and submit the budget of the United States Government, in accordance with section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, \$101,000,000, of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be available for official representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Office of Management and Budget may be used for the purpose of reviewing any agricultural marketing orders or any activities or regulations under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the transcript of actual testimony of witnesses, except for testimony of officials of the Office of Management and Budget, before the Committees on Appropriations or their subcommittees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act may be expended for the altering of the annual work plan developed by the Corps of Engineers for submission to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for the Office of Management and Budget by this Act, no less than three full-time equivalent senior staff position shall be dedicated solely to the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or prior Acts shall be used, directly or indirectly, by the Office of Management and Budget, for evaluating or determining if water resource project or study reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers acting through the Secretary of the Army are in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and requirements relevant to the Civil Works water resource planning process: *Provided further*, That the Office of Management and Budget shall have not more than 60 days in which to perform budgetary policy reviews of water resource matters on which the Chief of Engineers has reported: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees when the 60-day review is initiated: *Provided further*, That if water resource reports have not been transmitted to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees within 15 days after the end of the Office of Management and Budget review period based on the notification from the Director, Congress shall assume Office of Management and Budget concurrence with the report and act accordingly.

In addition, \$2,000,000 for the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to hire additional personnel dedicated to regulatory review and reforms: *Provided*, That these amounts shall be in addition to any other amounts available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That these funds may not be used to backfill vacancies.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; for research activities pursuant to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-469); not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for participation in joint projects or in the provision of services on matters of mutual interest with nonprofit, research, or public organizations or agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$18,400,000: *Provided*, That the Office is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, both real and personal, public and private, without fiscal year limitation, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office.

FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS
HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS
PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$280,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the designated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("HIDTAs"), of which not less than 51 percent shall be transferred to State and local entities for drug control activities and shall be obligated not later than 120 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That up to 49 percent may be transferred to Federal agencies and departments in amounts determined by the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, of which up to \$2,700,000 may be used for auditing services and associated activities: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the requirements of Public Law 106-58, any unexpended funds obligated prior to fiscal year 2017 may be used for any other approved activities of that HIDTA, subject to reprogramming requirements: *Provided further*, That each HIDTA designated as of September 30, 2018, shall be funded at not less than the fiscal year 2018 base level, unless the Director submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate justification for changes to those levels based on clearly articulated priorities and published Office of National Drug Control Policy performance measures of effectiveness: *Provided further*, That the Director shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the initial allocation of fiscal year 2019 funding among HIDTAs not later than 45 days after enactment of this Act, and shall notify the Committees of planned uses of discretionary HIDTA funding, as determined in consultation with the HIDTA Directors, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds so transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein and upon notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

OTHER FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For other drug control activities authorized by the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-469), \$117,327,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available as follows: \$99,000,000 for the Drug-Free Communities Program, of which \$2,000,000 shall be made available as directed by section 4 of Public Law 107-82, as amended by Public Law 109-469 (21 U.S.C. 1521 note); \$2,000,000 for drug court training and technical assistance;

\$9,500,000 for anti-doping activities; \$2,577,000 for the United States membership dues to the World Anti-Doping Agency; and \$1,250,000 shall be made available as directed by section 1105 of Public Law 109-469; and \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for activities authorized by section 103 of Public Law 114-198: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading may be transferred to other Federal departments and agencies to carry out such activities.

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to meet unanticipated needs, in furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 108, \$1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT AND
REFORM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the furtherance of integrated, efficient, secure, and effective uses of information technology in the Federal Government, \$19,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may transfer these funds to one or more other agencies to carry out projects to meet these purposes.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Vice President to provide assistance to the President in connection with specially assigned functions; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and 3 U.S.C. 106, including subsistence expenses as authorized by 3 U.S.C. 106, which shall be expended and accounted for as provided in that section; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$4,288,000.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the care, operation, refurbishing, improvement, and to the extent not otherwise provided for, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the official residence of the Vice President; the hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$90,000 pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 106(b)(2), \$302,000: *Provided*, That advances, repayments, or transfers from this appropriation may be made to any department or agency for expenses of carrying out such activities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. From funds made available in this Act under the headings "The White House", "Executive Residence at the White House", "White House Repair and Restoration", "Council of Economic Advisers", "National Security Council and Homeland Security Council", "Office of Administration", "Special Assistance to the President", and "Official Residence of the Vice President", the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (or such other officer as the President may designate in writing), may, with advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any such appropriation to any other such appropriation, to be merged with and available for the same time and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided*, That the amount of an appropriation shall not be increased by more than 50 percent by such transfers: *Provided further*, That no amount shall be transferred from "Special Assistance to the President"

or “Official Residence of the Vice President” without the approval of the Vice President.

SEC. 202. (a) During fiscal year 2019, any Executive order or Presidential memorandum issued or revoked by the President shall be accompanied by a written statement from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on the budgetary impact, including costs, benefits, and revenues, of such order or memorandum.

(b) Any such statement shall include—

(1) a narrative summary of the budgetary impact of such order or memorandum on the Federal Government;

(2) the impact on mandatory and discretionary obligations and outlays as the result of such order or memorandum, listed by Federal agency, for each year in the 5-fiscal-year period beginning in fiscal year 2019; and

(3) the impact on revenues of the Federal Government as the result of such order or memorandum over the 5-fiscal-year period beginning in fiscal year 2019.

(c) If an Executive order or Presidential memorandum is issued during fiscal year 2019 due to a national emergency, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may issue the statement required by subsection (a) not later than 15 days after the date that such order or memorandum is issued.

(d) The requirement for cost estimates for Presidential memoranda shall only apply for Presidential memoranda estimated to have a regulatory cost in excess of \$100,000,000.

This title may be cited as the “Executive Office of the President Appropriations Act, 2019”.

TITLE III THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Supreme Court, as required by law, excluding care of the building and grounds, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; not to exceed \$10,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for miscellaneous expenses, to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, \$84,703,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall remain available until expended.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of the court.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon the Architect by 40 U.S.C. 6111 and 6112, \$15,999,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of officers and employees, and for necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, \$32,016,000.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief judge and judges of the court.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of officers and employees of the court, services, and necessary expenses of the court, as authorized by law, \$19,450,000.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of the chief judge and judges of the court.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries of judges of the United States Court of Federal Claims, magistrate

judges, and all other officers and employees of the Federal Judiciary not otherwise specifically provided for, necessary expenses of the courts, and the purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for Probation and Pretrial Services Office staff, as authorized by law, \$5,154,461,000 (including the purchase of firearms and ammunition); of which not to exceed \$27,817,000 shall remain available until expended for space alteration projects and for furniture and furnishings related to new space alteration and construction projects.

In addition, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary under current law for the salaries of circuit and district judges (including judges of the territorial courts of the United States), bankruptcy judges, and justices and judges retired from office or from regular active service.

In addition, for expenses of the United States Court of Federal Claims associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-660), not to exceed \$8,475,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For the operation of Federal Defender organizations; the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent persons under 18 U.S.C. 3006A and 3599, and for the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of persons furnishing investigative, expert, and other services for such representations as authorized by law; the compensation (in accordance with the maximums under 18 U.S.C. 3006A) and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to assist the court in criminal cases where the defendant has waived representation by counsel; the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed to represent jurors in civil actions for the protection of their employment, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1875(d)(1); the compensation and reimbursement of expenses of attorneys appointed under 18 U.S.C. 983(b)(1) in connection with certain judicial civil forfeiture proceedings; the compensation and reimbursement of travel expenses of guardians ad litem appointed under 18 U.S.C. 4100(b); and for necessary training and general administrative expenses, \$1,140,846,000 to remain available until expended.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For fees and expenses of jurors as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1871 and 1876; compensation of jury commissioners as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 1863; and compensation of commissioners appointed in condemnation cases pursuant to rule 71.1(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (28 U.S.C. Appendix Rule 71.1(h)), \$49,750,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the compensation of land commissioners shall not exceed the daily equivalent of the highest rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5332.

COURT SECURITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the provision of protective guard services for United States courthouses and other facilities housing Federal court operations, and the procurement, installation, and maintenance of security systems and equipment for United States courthouses and other facilities housing Federal court operations, including building ingress-egress control, inspection of mail and packages, directed security patrols, perimeter security, basic security services provided by the Federal Protective Service, and other similar activities as authorized by section 1010 of the Judicial Improvement and Access to Justice Act (Public Law 100-702),

\$604,460,000, of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended, to be expended directly or transferred to the United States Marshals Service, which shall be responsible for administering the Judicial Facility Security Program consistent with standards or guidelines agreed to by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the Attorney General.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as authorized by law, including travel as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1345, hire of a passenger motor vehicle as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b), advertising and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$92,413,000, of which not to exceed \$8,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Judicial Center, as authorized by Public Law 90-219, \$29,819,000; of which \$1,800,000 shall remain available through September 30, 2020, to provide education and training to Federal court personnel; and of which not to exceed \$1,500 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 58 of title 28, United States Code, \$18,548,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000 is authorized for official reception and representation expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 302. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Judiciary in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except “Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Defender Services” and “Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services, Fees of Jurors and Commissioners”, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under sections 604 and 608 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in section 608.

SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the salaries and expenses appropriation for “Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services” shall be available for official reception and representation expenses of the Judicial Conference of the United States: *Provided*, That such available funds shall not exceed \$11,000 and shall be administered by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in the capacity as Secretary of the Judicial Conference.

SEC. 304. Section 3315(a) of title 40, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “Federal” for “executive” each place it appears.

SEC. 305. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. 561-569, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Marshals Service shall provide, for such courthouses as its Director may designate in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of

the United States Courts, for purposes of a pilot program, the security services that 40 U.S.C. 1315 authorizes the Department of Homeland Security to provide, except for the services specified in 40 U.S.C. 1315(b)(2)(E). For building-specific security services at these courthouses, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall reimburse the United States Marshals Service rather than the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 306. (a) Section 203(c) of the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-650; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended in the matter following paragraph 12—

(1) in the second sentence (relating to the District of Kansas), by striking “27 years and 6 months” and inserting “28 years and 6 months”; and

(2) in the sixth sentence (relating to the District of Hawaii), by striking “24 years and 6 months” and inserting “25 years and 6 months”.

(b) Section 406 of the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-115; 119 Stat. 2470; 28 U.S.C. 133 note) is amended in the second sentence (relating to the eastern District of Missouri) by striking “25 years and 6 months” and inserting “26 years and 6 months”.

(c) Section 312(c)(2) of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (Public Law 107-273; 28 U.S.C. 133 note), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking “16 years” and inserting “17 years”; and

(2) in the second sentence (relating to the central District of California), by striking “15 years and 6 months” and inserting “16 years and 6 months”; and

(3) in the third sentence (relating to the western district of North Carolina), by striking “14 years” and inserting “15 years”.

This title may be cited as the “Judiciary Appropriations Act, 2019”.

TITLE IV DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR RESIDENT TUITION SUPPORT

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia, to be deposited into a dedicated account, for a nationwide program to be administered by the Mayor, for District of Columbia resident tuition support, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds, including any interest accrued thereon, may be used on behalf of eligible District of Columbia residents to pay an amount based upon the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public institutions of higher education, or to pay up to \$2,500 each year at eligible private institutions of higher education: *Provided further*, That the awarding of such funds may be prioritized on the basis of a resident's academic merit, the income and need of eligible students and such other factors as may be authorized: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia government shall maintain a dedicated account for the Resident Tuition Support Program that shall consist of the Federal funds appropriated to the Program in this Act and any subsequent appropriations, any unobligated balances from prior fiscal years, and any interest earned in this or any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the account shall be under the control of the District of Columbia Chief Financial Officer, who shall use those funds solely for the purposes of carrying out the Resident Tuition Support Program: *Provided further*, That the Office of the Chief Financial Officer shall

provide a quarterly financial report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for these funds showing, by object class, the expenditures made and the purpose therefor.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF CO- LUMBIA

For a Federal payment of necessary expenses, as determined by the Mayor of the District of Columbia in written consultation with the elected county or city officials of surrounding jurisdictions, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the costs of providing public safety at events related to the presence of the National Capital in the District of Columbia, including support requested by the Director of the United States Secret Service in carrying out protective duties under the direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security, and for the costs of providing support to respond to immediate and specific terrorist threats or attacks in the District of Columbia or surrounding jurisdictions.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

For salaries and expenses for the District of Columbia Courts, \$244,939,000 to be allocated as follows: for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, \$13,379,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; for the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, \$121,251,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; for the District of Columbia Court System, \$71,909,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500 is for official reception and representation expenses; and \$38,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for capital improvements for District of Columbia courthouse facilities: *Provided*, That funds made available for capital improvements shall be expended consistent with the District of Columbia Courts master plan study and facilities condition assessment: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That 30 days after providing written notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the District of Columbia Courts may reallocate not more than \$9,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading among the items and entities funded under this heading: *Provided further*, That the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia may, by regulation, establish a program substantially similar to the program set forth in subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 5, United States Code, for employees of the District of Columbia Courts.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR DEFENDER SERVICES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments authorized under section 11-2604 and section 11-2605, D.C. Official Code (relating to representation provided under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act), payments for counsel appointed in proceedings in the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia under chapter 23 of title 16, D.C. Official Code, or pursuant to contractual agreements to provide guardian ad litem representation, training, technical assistance, and such other services as are necessary to improve the quality of guardian ad litem representation, payments for counsel appointed in adoption proceedings under chapter 3 of title 16, D.C.

Official Code, and payments authorized under section 21-2060, D.C. Official Code (relating to services provided under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986), \$46,005,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$20,000,000 in unobligated funds provided in this account may be transferred to and merged with funds made available under the heading “Federal Payment to the District of Columbia Courts,” to be available for the same period and purposes as funds made available under that heading for capital improvements to District of Columbia courthouse facilities: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading shall be administered by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, this appropriation shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for expenses of other Federal agencies.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For salaries and expenses, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, \$256,724,000, of which not to exceed \$2,000 is for official reception and representation expenses related to Community Supervision and Pretrial Services Agency programs, and of which not to exceed \$25,000 is for dues and assessments relating to the implementation of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Interstate Supervision Act of 2002: *Provided*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$183,166,000 shall be for necessary expenses of Community Supervision and Sex Offender Registration, to include expenses relating to the supervision of adults subject to protection orders or the provision of services for or related to such persons, of which \$5,919,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021 for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$73,558,000 shall be available to the Pretrial Services Agency, of which \$7,304,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2021 for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of other Federal agencies: *Provided further*, That amounts under this heading may be used for programmatic incentives for defendants to successfully complete their terms of supervision.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE

For salaries and expenses, including the transfer and hire of motor vehicles, of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service, as authorized by the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, \$45,858,000, of which \$4,471,000 shall be available until September 30, 2021 for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for headquarters offices, field offices, and related facilities: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other

provision of law, all amounts under this heading shall be apportioned quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget and obligated and expended in the same manner as funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of Federal agencies.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

For a Federal payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, \$2,150,000, to remain available until expended, to support initiatives related to the coordination of Federal and local criminal justice resources in the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR JUDICIAL COMMISSIONS

For a Federal payment, to remain available until September 30, 2020, to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, \$295,000, and for the Judicial Nomination Commission, \$270,000.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

For a Federal payment for a school improvement program in the District of Columbia, \$52,500,000, to remain available until expended, for payments authorized under the Scholarship for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112-10): *Provided*, That, to the extent that funds are available for opportunity scholarships and following the priorities included in section 3006 of such Act, the Secretary of Education shall make scholarships available to students eligible under section 3013(3) of such Act (Public Law 112-10; 125 Stat. 211) including students who were not offered a scholarship during any previous school year: *Provided further*, That within funds provided for opportunity scholarships up to \$1,200,000 shall be for the activities specified in sections 3007(b) through 3007(d) of the Act and up to \$500,000 shall be for the activities specified in section 3009 of the Act.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia National Guard, \$435,000, to remain available until expended for the Major General David F. Wherley, Jr. District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Program.

FEDERAL PAYMENT FOR TESTING AND TREATMENT OF HIV/AIDS

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia for the testing of individuals for, and the treatment of individuals with, human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in the District of Columbia, \$2,000,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

Local funds are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the General Fund of the District of Columbia ("General Fund") for programs and activities set forth under the heading "PART A—SUMMARY OF EXPENSES" and at the rate set forth under such heading, as included in the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Act of 2018 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia, as amended as of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in section 450A of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (section 1-204.50a, D.C. Official Code), sections 816 and 817 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (secs. 47-369.01 and 47-369.02, D.C. Official Code), and provisions of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for operating expenses for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2019 under this heading shall not exceed the estimates included in the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Act of 2018 submitted to Congress by the District of Columbia, as amended as of the date of enactment of this

Act or the sum of the total revenues of the District of Columbia for such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated may be increased by proceeds of one-time transactions, which are expended for emergency or unanticipated operating or capital needs: *Provided further*, That such increases shall be approved by enactment of local District law and shall comply with all reserve requirements contained in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the District of Columbia meets these requirements, including the apportioning by the Chief Financial Officer of the appropriations and funds made available to the District during fiscal year 2019, except that the Chief Financial Officer may not reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

For a Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, to continue implementation of the Combined Sewer Overflow Long-Term Plan: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority provides a 100 percent match for this payment.

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2019".

TITLE V

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Conference of the United States, authorized by 5 U.S.C. 591 et seq., \$3,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, of which not to exceed \$1,000 is for official reception and representation expenses.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and the rental of space (to include multiple year leases), in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$281,500,000, including not to exceed \$3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and not to exceed \$25,000 for the expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, of which not less than \$57,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, shall be for the purchase of information technology and of which not less than \$3,302,509 shall be for expenses of the Office of the Inspector General: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations in 31 U.S.C. 1553, amounts provided under this heading are available for the liquidation of obligations equal to current year payments on leases entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of recording and liquidating any lease obligations that should have been recorded and liquidated against accounts closed pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1552, and consistent with the preceding proviso, such amounts shall be transferred to and recorded in a no-year account in the Treasury, which has been established for the sole purpose of recording adjustments for and liquidating such unpaid obligations.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as au-

thorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$126,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SEC. 501. During fiscal year 2019, none of the amounts made available by this Act may be used to finalize or implement the Safety Standard for Recreational Off-Highway Vehicles published by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in the Federal Register on November 19, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 68964) until after—

(1) the National Academy of Sciences, in consultation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Department of Defense, completes a study to determine—

(A) the technical validity of the lateral stability and vehicle handling requirements proposed by such standard for purposes of reducing the risk of Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle (referred to in this section as "ROV") rollovers in the off-road environment, including the repeatability and reproducibility of testing for compliance with such requirements;

(B) the number of ROV rollovers that would be prevented if the proposed requirements were adopted;

(C) whether there is a technical basis for the proposal to provide information on a point-of-sale hangtag about a ROV's rollover resistance on a progressive scale; and

(D) the effect on the utility of ROVs used by the United States military if the proposed requirements were adopted; and

(2) a report containing the results of the study completed under paragraph (1) is delivered to—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-252), \$9,200,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall be transferred to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for election reform activities authorized under the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$333,118,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$333,118,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2019 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2019 appropriation estimated at \$0: *Provided further*, That any offsetting collections received

in excess of \$333,118,000 in fiscal year 2019 shall not be available for obligation: *Provided further*, That remaining offsetting collections from prior years collected in excess of the amount specified for collection in each such year and otherwise becoming available on October 1, 2018, shall not be available for obligation: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B), proceeds from the use of a competitive bidding system that may be retained and made available for obligation shall not exceed \$130,284,000 for fiscal year 2019: *Provided further*, That, of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than \$11,064,000 shall be for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SEC. 510. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to modify, amend, or change its rules or regulations for universal service support payments to implement the February 27, 2004 recommendations of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service regarding single connection or primary line restrictions on universal service support payments.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$42,982,000, to be derived from the Deposit Insurance Fund or, only when appropriate, the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, \$71,250,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for reception and representation expenses.

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and including hire of experts and consultants, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$1,500) and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$26,200,000: *Provided*, That public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel may be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons employed intermittently in the Government service, and compensation as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received from fees charged to non-Federal participants at labor-management relations conferences shall be credited to and merged with this account, to be available without further appropriation for the costs of carrying out these conferences.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$309,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$300,000 shall be available for use to contract with a person or persons for collection services in accordance with

the terms of 31 U.S.C. 3718: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$136,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$17,000,000 in offsetting collections derived from fees sufficient to implement and enforce the Telemarketing Sales Rule, promulgated under the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), shall be credited to this account, and be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2019, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2019 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$156,700,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission may be used to implement subsection (e)(2)(B) of section 43 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831t).

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Amounts in the Fund, including revenues and collections deposited into the Fund, shall be available for necessary expenses of real property management and related activities not otherwise provided for, including operation, maintenance, and protection of federally owned and leased buildings; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving governmental agencies (including space adjustments and telecommunications relocation expenses) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of space; contractual services incident to cleaning or servicing buildings, and moving; repair and alteration of federally owned buildings, including grounds, approaches, and appurtenances; care and safeguarding of sites; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; acquisition of buildings and sites by purchase, condemnation, or as otherwise authorized by law; acquisition of options to purchase buildings and sites; conversion and extension of federally owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects by contract or otherwise; construction of new buildings (including equipment for such buildings); and payment of principal, interest, and any other obligations for public buildings acquired by installment purchase and purchase contract; in the aggregate amount of \$9,633,450,000, of which—

(1) \$1,080,068,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and acquisition (including funds for sites and expenses, and associated design and construction services) as follows:

(A) \$767,900,000 shall be for the Department of Transportation Lease Purchase Option, Washington, District of Columbia;

(B) \$100,000,000 shall be for the DHS Consolidation at St. Elizabeths, Washington, District of Columbia;

(C) \$27,268,000 shall be for the Former Hardesty Federal Complex, Kansas City, Missouri;

(D) \$9,000,000 shall be for the Southeast Federal Center Remediation, Washington, District of Columbia; and

(E) \$175,900,000 shall be for the Calexico West Land Port of Entry, Calexico, California;

Provided, That each of the foregoing limits of costs on new construction and acquisition projects may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other such projects, but not to exceed 10 percent of the amounts included in a transmitted prospectus, if required, unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of a greater amount;

(2) \$890,419,000 shall remain available until expended for repairs and alterations, including associated design and construction services, of which—

(A) \$424,690,000 is for Major Repairs and Alterations;

(B) \$373,556,000 is for Basic Repairs and Alterations; and

(C) \$92,173,000 is for Special Emphasis Programs, of which—

(i) \$30,000,000 is for Fire and Life Safety;

(ii) \$11,500,000 is for Judiciary Capital Security; and

(iii) \$50,673,000 is for Consolidation Activities: *Provided*, That consolidation projects result in reduced annual rent paid by the tenant agency: *Provided further*, That no consolidation project exceed \$10,000,000 in costs: *Provided further*, That consolidation projects are approved by each of the committees specified in section 3307(a) of title 40, United States Code: *Provided further*, That preference is given to consolidation projects that achieve a utilization rate of 130 usable square feet or less per person for office space: *Provided further*, That the obligation of funds under this paragraph for consolidation activities may not be made until 10 days after a proposed spending plan and explanation for each project to be undertaken, including estimated savings, has been submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate:

Provided, That funds made available in this or any previous Act in the Federal Buildings Fund for Repairs and Alterations shall, for prospectus projects, be limited to the amount identified for each project, except each project in this or any previous Act may be increased by an amount not to exceed 10 percent unless advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations of a greater amount: *Provided further*, That additional projects for which prospectuses have been fully approved may be funded under this category only if advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the amounts provided in this or any prior Act for “Repairs and Alterations” may be used to fund costs associated with implementing security improvements to buildings necessary to meet the minimum standards for security in accordance with current law and in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines of the appropriate Committees of the House and Senate: *Provided further*, That the difference between the funds appropriated and expended on any projects in this or any prior Act, under the heading “Repairs and Alterations”, may be transferred to Basic Repairs and Alterations or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects: *Provided further*, That the amount provided in this or any prior Act for Basic Repairs and Alterations may be used to pay claims against the Government arising from any projects under the heading “Repairs and Alterations” or used to fund authorized increases in prospectus projects;

(3) \$5,418,845,000 for rental of space to remain available until expended; and

(4) \$2,244,118,000 for building operations to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total amount of funds made available from this Fund to the General Services Administration shall not be available for expenses of any construction, repair, alteration

and acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required by 40 U.S.C. 3307(a), has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus: *Provided further*, That funds available in the Federal Buildings Fund may be expended for emergency repairs when advance approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That amounts necessary to provide reimbursable special services to other agencies under 40 U.S.C. 592(b)(2) and amounts to provide such reimbursable fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control as may be appropriate to enable the United States Secret Service to perform its protective functions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3056, shall be available from such revenues and collections: *Provided further*, That revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2019, excluding reimbursements under 40 U.S.C. 592(b)(2), in excess of the aggregate new obligational authority authorized for Real Property Activities of the Federal Buildings Fund in this Act shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

GOVERNMENT-WIDE POLICY

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide policy and evaluation activities associated with the management of real and personal property assets and certain administrative services; Government-wide policy support responsibilities relating to acquisition, travel, motor vehicles, information technology management, and related technology activities; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$58,499,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for Government-wide activities associated with utilization and donation of surplus personal property; disposal of real property; agency-wide policy direction, management, and communications; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$49,440,000, of which not less than \$26,890,000 is for Real and Personal Property Management and Disposal; and up to \$22,550,000 is for the Office of the Administrator, of which not to exceed \$7,500 is for official reception and representation expenses.

CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, for the activities associated with the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals, \$9,301,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General and service authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$65,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for payment for information and detection of fraud against the Government, including payment for recovery of stolen Government property: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for awards to employees of other Federal agencies and private citizens in recognition of efforts and initiatives resulting in enhanced Office of Inspector General effectiveness.

In addition to the foregoing appropriation, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency for enhancements to www.oversight.gov: *Provided*, That these amounts shall be in addition to any other amounts available to the Council of the In-

spectors General on Integrity and Efficiency for such purpose.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (3 U.S.C. 102 note), and Public Law 95-138, \$4,796,000.

FEDERAL CITIZEN SERVICES FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Products and Programs, including services authorized by 40 U.S.C. 323 and 44 U.S.C. 3604; and for necessary expenses in support of interagency projects that enable the Federal Government to enhance its ability to conduct activities electronically, through the development and implementation of innovative uses of information technology; \$55,000,000, to be deposited into the Federal Citizen Services Fund: *Provided*, That the previous amount may be transferred to Federal agencies to carry out the purpose of the Federal Citizen Services Fund: *Provided further*, That the appropriations, revenues, reimbursements, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of Federal Citizen Services and other activities that enable the Federal Government to enhance its ability to conduct activities electronically in the aggregate amount not to exceed \$100,000,000: *Provided further*, That appropriations, revenues, reimbursements, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2019 in excess of such amount shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the transfer authorities provided herein shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

ASSET PROCEEDS AND SPACE MANAGEMENT FUND

For carrying out the purposes of the Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-287), \$15,500,000, to be deposited into the Asset Proceeds and Space Management Fund, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IMPROVEMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of the Environmental Review Improvement Fund established pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4370m-8(d), \$6,070,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 520. Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 521. Funds in the Federal Buildings Fund made available for fiscal year 2019 for Federal Buildings Fund activities may be transferred between such activities only to the extent necessary to meet program requirements: *Provided*, That any proposed transfers shall be approved in advance by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 522. Except as otherwise provided in this title, funds made available by this Act shall be used to transmit a fiscal year 2020 request for United States Courthouse construction only if the request: (1) meets the design guide standards for construction as established and approved by the General Services Administration, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the Office of Management and Budget; (2) reflects the priorities of the Judicial Conference of the United States as set out in its approved Courthouse Project Priorities plan; and (3) includes a standardized courtroom utilization study of each facility to be constructed, replaced, or expanded.

SEC. 523. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to increase the amount of occupiable square feet, provide cleaning services, security enhancements, or any other service usually provided through the Federal Buildings Fund, to any agency that does not pay the rate per square foot assessment for space and services as determined by the General Services Administration in consideration of the Public Buildings Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-313).

SEC. 524. From funds made available under the heading Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue, claims against the Government of less than \$250,000 arising from direct construction projects and acquisition of buildings may be liquidated from savings effected in other construction projects with prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 525. In any case in which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate adopt a resolution granting lease authority pursuant to a prospectus transmitted to Congress by the Administrator of the General Services Administration under 40 U.S.C. 3307, the Administrator shall ensure that the delineated area of procurement is identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus for all lease agreements, except that, if the Administrator determines that the delineated area of the procurement should not be identical to the delineated area included in the prospectus, the Administrator shall provide an explanatory statement to each of such committees and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate prior to exercising any lease authority provided in the resolution.

SEC. 526. With respect to each project funded under the heading "Major Repairs and Alterations" or "Judiciary Capital Security Program", and with respect to E-Government projects funded under the heading "Federal Citizen Services Fund", the Administrator of General Services shall submit a spending plan and explanation for each project to be undertaken to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For payment to the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation Trust Fund, established by section 10 of Public Law 93-642, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Merit Systems Protection Board pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, and the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, direct procurement of survey printing, and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$44,490,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, and in addition not to exceed \$2,345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for administrative expenses to adjudicate retirement appeals to be transferred from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund in amounts determined by the Merit Systems Protection Board.

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL
FOUNDATION

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL
TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payment to the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, pursuant to the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation Act (20 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.), \$1,875,000, to remain available until expended, of which, notwithstanding sections 8 and 9 of such Act: (1) up to \$50,000 shall be used to conduct financial audits pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-289); and (2) up to \$1,000,000 shall be available to carry out the activities authorized by section 6(7) of Public Law 102-259 and section 817(a) of Public Law 106-568 (20 U.S.C. 5604(7)): *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading \$200,000 shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, to remain available until expended, for audits and investigations of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

ENVIRONMENTAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FUND

For payment to the Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund to carry out activities authorized in the Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act of 1998, \$3,200,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS

ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the administration of the National Archives and Records Administration and archived Federal records and related activities, as provided by law, and for expenses necessary for the review and declassification of documents, the activities of the Public Interest Declassification Board, the operations and maintenance of the electronic records archives, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901), including maintenance, repairs, and cleaning, \$375,105,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, Public Law 110-409, 122 Stat. 4302-16 (2008), and the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), and for the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$4,801,000.

REPAIRS AND RESTORATION

For the repair, alteration, and improvement of archives facilities, and to provide adequate storage for holdings, \$7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND

RECORDS COMMISSION

GRANTS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for allocations and grants for historical publications and records as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 2504, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN
FUND

For the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund program as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 9812, 9822 and 9910, \$2,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2020, for technical assistance to low-income designated credit unions.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Government Ethics pur-

suant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, and the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act of 2012, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$16,439,000.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978 and the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; advances for reimbursements to applicable funds of OPM and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred under Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended; and payment of per diem and/or subsistence allowances to employees where Voting Rights Act activities require an employee to remain overnight at his or her post of duty, \$132,172,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not to exceed \$14,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2020, for information technology infrastructure modernization and Trust Fund Federal Financial System migration or modernization, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$639,018 may be made available for strengthening the capacity and capabilities of the acquisition workforce (as defined by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as amended (41 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.)), including the recruitment, hiring, training, and retention of such workforce and information technology in support of acquisition workforce effectiveness or for management solutions to improve acquisition management; and in addition \$133,483,000 for administrative expenses, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of OPM without regard to other statutes, including direct procurement of printed materials, for the retirement and insurance programs: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this appropriation shall not affect the authority to use applicable trust funds as provided by sections 8348(a)(1)(B), 8958(f)(2)(A), 8988(f)(2)(A), and 9004(f)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit of OPM established pursuant to Executive Order No. 9358 of July 1, 1943, or any successor unit of like purpose: *Provided further*, That the President's Commission on White House Fellows, established by Executive Order No. 11183 of October 3, 1964, may, during fiscal year 2019, accept donations of money, property, and personal services: *Provided further*, That such donations, including those from prior years, may be used for the development of publicity materials to provide information about the White House Fellows, except that no such donations shall be accepted for travel or reimbursement of travel expenses, or for the salaries of employees of such Commission.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF TRUST FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provi-

sions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$5,000,000, and in addition, not to exceed \$25,265,000 for administrative expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other oversight of the Office of Personnel Management's retirement and insurance programs, to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management, as determined by the Inspector General: *Provided*, That the Inspector General is authorized to rent conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out functions of the Office of Special Counsel pursuant to Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1978, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-454), the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-12) as amended by Public Law 107-304, the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-199), and the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-353), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, payment of fees and expenses for witnesses, rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$26,535,000.

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Postal Regulatory Commission in carrying out the provisions of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435), \$15,200,000, to be derived by transfer from the Postal Service Fund and expended as authorized by section 603(a) of such Act.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT

BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, as authorized by section 1061 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee), \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed \$3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$1,658,302,000, to remain available until expended; of which not less than \$15,206,269 shall be for the Office of Inspector General; of which not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions; and of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations and staffs to exchange views concerning securities matters, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance including: (1) incidental expenses such as meals; (2) travel and transportation; and (3) related lodging or subsistence; and of which not less than \$75,081,000 shall be for the Division of Economic and Risk Analysis.

In addition to the foregoing appropriation, for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for the Commission's New

York regional office facilities, not to exceed \$37,188,942, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for purposes of calculating the fee rate under section 31(j) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee(j)) for fiscal year 2019, all amounts appropriated under this heading shall be deemed to be the regular appropriation to the Commission for fiscal year 2019: *Provided further*, That fees and charges authorized by section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,658,302,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of this account and not to exceed \$37,188,942 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for costs under this heading associated with relocation under a replacement lease for the Commission's New York regional office facilities: *Provided further*, That the total amount appropriated under this heading from the general fund for fiscal year 2019 shall be reduced as such offsetting fees are received so as to result in a final total fiscal year 2019 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That if any amount of the appropriation for costs associated with relocation under a replacement lease for the Commission's New York regional office facilities is subsequently de-obligated by the Commission, such amount that was derived from the general fund shall be returned to the general fund, and such amounts that were derived from fees or assessments collected for such purpose shall be paid to each national securities exchange and national securities association, respectively, in proportion to any fees or assessments paid by such national securities exchange or national securities association under section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78ee) in fiscal year 2019.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101–4118 for civilian employees; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses; \$26,000,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever the President deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by sections 1343 and 1344 of title 31, United States Code, and not to exceed \$3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$267,500,000, of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be available for examinations, reviews, and other lender oversight activities: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of publications developed by the Small Business Administration, and certain loan program activities, including fees authorized by section 5(b) of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, revenues received from all such activities shall be credited to

this account, to remain available until expended, for carrying out these purposes without further appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Small Business Administration may accept gifts in an amount not to exceed \$4,000,000 and may co-sponsor activities, each in accordance with section 132(a) of division K of Public Law 108–447, during fiscal year 2019: *Provided further*, That \$6,100,000 shall be available for the Loan Modernization and Accounting System, to be available until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That \$3,000,000 shall be for the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program under section 34 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657d).

ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of programs supporting entrepreneurial and small business development, \$241,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That \$130,000,000 shall be available to fund grants for performance in fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2020 as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That \$31,000,000 shall be for marketing, management, and technical assistance under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)) by intermediaries that make microloans under the microloan program: *Provided further*, That \$18,000,000 shall be available for grants to States to carry out export programs that assist small business concerns authorized under section 22(l) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 649(l)).

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$21,900,000.

OFFICE OF ADVOCACY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Advocacy in carrying out the provisions of title II of Public Law 94–305 (15 U.S.C. 634a et seq.) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), \$9,120,000, to remain available until expended.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2019 commitments to guarantee loans under section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 shall not exceed \$7,500,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2019 commitments for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed \$30,000,000,000 for a combination of amortizing term loans and the aggregated maximum line of credit provided by revolving loans: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2019 commitments for loans authorized under subparagraph (C) of section 502(7) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696(7)) shall not exceed \$7,500,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2019 commitments to guarantee loans for debentures under section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 shall not exceed \$4,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2019, guarantees of trust certificates authorized by section 5(g) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed a principal amount of \$12,000,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$155,150,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 530. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Small Business Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this paragraph shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 608 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 531. None of the funds made available to the Small Business Administration in this Act may be provided to a company—

(1) that is headquartered in the People's Republic of China; or

(2) for which more than 25 percent of the voting stock of the company is owned by affiliates that are citizens of the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 532. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study on whether the provision of match-making services that, using data collected through outside entities such as local chambers of commerce, link veteran entrepreneurs to business leads in given industry sectors or geographic regions, would enhance the existing veterans entrepreneurship programs of the Administration.

SEC. 533. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall—

(1) work with Federal agencies to review each Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization's efforts to comply with the requirements under section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)); and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives—

(A) a report on Federal agency compliance with the requirements under such section 15(k); and

(B) a report detailing the status of issuance by the Small Business Administration of detailed guidance for the peer review process of the Small Business Procurement Advisory Council in order to facilitate a more in depth review of Federal agency compliance with the requirements under such section 15(k).

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For payment to the Postal Service Fund for revenue forgone on free and reduced rate mail, pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, \$55,235,000: *Provided*, That mail for overseas voting and mail for the blind shall continue to be free: *Provided further*, That 6-day delivery and rural delivery of mail shall continue at not less than the 1983 level: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Postal Service by this Act shall be used to implement any rule, regulation, or policy of charging any officer or employee of any State or local child support enforcement agency, or any individual participating in a State or local program of child support enforcement, a fee for information requested or provided concerning an address of a postal customer: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to consolidate or close small rural and other small post offices.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$250,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Postal Service Fund and expended as authorized by section 603(b)(3) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435).

UNITED STATES TAX COURT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including contract reporting and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$51,515,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That travel expenses of the judges shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 601. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 605. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

SEC. 606. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 607. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 608. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds provided in this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies or entities funded in this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2019, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury derived by the collection of fees and available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates a new program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress; (4) proposes to use

funds directed for a specific activity by the Committee on Appropriations of either the House of Representatives or the Senate for a different purpose; (5) augments existing programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; (6) reduces existing programs, projects, or activities by \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) creates or reorganizes offices, programs, or activities unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That prior to any significant reorganization or restructuring of offices, programs, or activities, each agency or entity funded in this Act shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency funded by this Act shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That at a minimum the report shall include: (1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level; (2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project, and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriation; and (3) an identification of items of special congressional interest: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated or limited for salaries and expenses for an agency shall be reduced by \$100,000 per day for each day after the required date that the report has not been submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 609. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2019 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2019 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2020, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 610. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of the President to request—

(1) any official background investigation report on any individual from the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

(2) a determination with respect to the treatment of an organization as described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code from the Department of the Treasury or the Internal Revenue Service.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply—

(1) in the case of an official background investigation report, if such individual has given express written consent for such request not more than 6 months prior to the date of such request and during the same presidential administration; or

(2) if such request is required due to extraordinary circumstances involving national security.

SEC. 611. The cost accounting standards promulgated under chapter 15 of title 41, United States Code shall not apply with respect to a contract under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 612. For the purpose of resolving litigation and implementing any settlement agreements regarding the nonforeign area cost-of-living allowance program, the Office of Personnel Management may accept and utilize (without regard to any restriction on unanticipated travel expenses imposed in an Appropriations Act) funds made available to the Office of Personnel Management pursuant to court approval.

SEC. 613. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefits program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 614. The provision of section 613 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 615. In order to promote Government access to commercial information technology, the restriction on purchasing non-domestic articles, materials, and supplies set forth in chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly known as the Buy American Act), shall not apply to the acquisition by the Federal Government of information technology (as defined in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code), that is a commercial item (as defined in section 103 of title 41, United States Code).

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding section 1353 of title 31, United States Code, no officer or employee of any regulatory agency or commission funded by this Act may accept on behalf of that agency, nor may such agency or commission accept, payment or reimbursement from a non-Federal entity for travel, subsistence, or related expenses for the purpose of enabling an officer or employee to attend and participate in any meeting or similar function relating to the official duties of the officer or employee when the entity offering payment or reimbursement is a person or entity subject to regulation by such agency or commission, or represents a person or entity subject to regulation by such agency or commission, unless the person or entity is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

SEC. 617. Notwithstanding section 708 of this Act, funds made available to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission by this or any other Act may be used for the inter-agency funding and sponsorship of a joint advisory committee to advise on emerging regulatory issues.

SEC. 618. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an Executive agency covered by this Act otherwise authorized to enter into contracts for either leases or the construction or alteration of real property for office, meeting, storage, or other space must consult with the General Services Administration before issuing a solicitation for offers of new leases or construction contracts, and in the case of succeeding leases, before entering into negotiations with the current lessor.

(2) Any such agency with authority to enter into an emergency lease may do so during any period declared by the President to require emergency leasing authority with respect to such agency.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "Executive agency covered by this Act" means any Executive agency provided funds by this Act, but does not include the General Services Administration or the United States Postal Service.

SEC. 619. (a) There are appropriated for the following activities the amounts required under current law:

(1) Compensation of the President (3 U.S.C. 102).

(2) Payments to—

(A) the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund (28 U.S.C. 377(o));

(B) the Judicial Survivors' Annuities Fund (28 U.S.C. 376(c)); and

(C) the United States Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement Fund (28 U.S.C. 178(1)).

(3) Payment of Government contributions—

(A) with respect to the health benefits of retired employees, as authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849); and

(B) with respect to the life insurance benefits for employees retiring after December 31, 1989 (5 U.S.C. ch. 87).

(4) Payment to finance the unfunded liability of new and increased annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (5 U.S.C. 8348).

(5) Payment of annuities authorized to be paid from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund by statutory provisions other than subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) Nothing in this section may be construed to exempt any amount appropriated by this section from any otherwise applicable limitation on the use of funds contained in this Act.

SEC. 620. In addition to amounts made available in prior fiscal years, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (Board) shall have authority to obligate funds for the scholarship program established by section 109(c)(2) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-204) in an aggregate amount not exceeding the amount of funds collected by the Board between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018, including accrued interest, as a result of the assessment of monetary penalties. Funds available for obligation in fiscal year 2019 shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 621. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Trade Commission to complete the draft report entitled "Interagency Working Group on Food Marketed to Children: Preliminary Proposed Nutrition Principles to Guide Industry Self-Regulatory Efforts" unless the Interagency Working Group on Food Marketed to Children complies with Executive Order No. 13563.

SEC. 622. None of the funds in this Act may be used for the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to award a contract, enter an extension of, or exercise an option on a contract to a contractor conducting the final quality review processes for background investigation fieldwork services or background investigation support services that, as of the date of the award of the contract, are being conducted by that contractor.

SEC. 623. (a) The head of each executive branch agency funded by this Act shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has the authority to participate in decisions regarding the budget planning process related to information technology.

(b) Amounts appropriated for any executive branch agency funded by this Act that are available for information technology shall be allocated within the agency, consistent with the provisions of appropriations Acts and budget guidelines and recommendations from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in such manner as specified by, or approved by, the Chief Information Officer of the agency in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer of the agency and budget officials.

SEC. 624. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of

chapter 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 625. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by a governmental entity to require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service to the public or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with the provider (as such terms are defined in sections 2510 and 2711 of title 18, United States Code) in a manner that violates the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 626. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Federal Communications Commission to modify, amend, or change the rules or regulations of the Commission for universal service high-cost support for competitive eligible telecommunications carriers in a way that is inconsistent with paragraph (e)(5) or (e)(6) of section 54.307 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on July 15, 2015: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the Commission from considering, developing, or adopting other support mechanisms as an alternative to Mobility Fund Phase II.

SEC. 627. No funds provided in this Act shall be used to deny an Inspector General funded under this Act timely access to any records, documents, or other materials available to the department or agency over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or to prevent or impede that Inspector General's access to such records, documents, or other materials, under any provision of law, except a provision of law that expressly refers to the Inspector General and expressly limits the Inspector General's right of access. A department or agency covered by this section shall provide its Inspector General with access to all such records, documents, and other materials in a timely manner. Each Inspector General shall ensure compliance with statutory limitations on disclosure relevant to the information provided by the establishment over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978. Each Inspector General covered by this section shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 5 calendar days any failures to comply with this requirement.

SEC. 628. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, adjudication activities, or other law enforcement- or victim assistance-related activity.

SEC. 629. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, issue, or implement any rule, regulation, or order regarding the disclosure of political contributions, contributions to tax exempt organizations, or dues paid to trade associations.

SEC. 630. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractors whose performance has been judged to be below satisfactory, behind schedule, over budget, or has failed to meet the basic requirements of a contract, unless the Agency determines that any such deviations are due to unforeseeable events, government-driven scope changes, or are not significant within the overall scope of the project and/or program and unless such awards or incentive fees are consistent with 16.401(e)(2) of the FAR.

SEC. 631. (a) None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay for travel and conference activities that result in a total cost to an Executive branch department, agency, board or commission of more than \$500,000 at any single conference unless the head of the Executive branch department, agency, board, or commission determines that such attendance is in the national interest and advance notice is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that includes the basis of that determination.

(b) None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay for the travel to or attendance of more than 50 employees, who are stationed in the United States, at any single conference occurring outside the United States unless the head of the Executive branch department, agency, board, or commission determines that such attendance is in the national interest and advance notice is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that includes the basis of that determination.

SEC. 632. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by departments and agencies funded in this Act to acquire telecommunications equipment produced by Huawei Technologies Company, ZTE Corporation or a high-impact or moderate-impact information system, as defined for security categorization in the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Federal Information Processing Standard Publication 199, "Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems" unless the agency has—

(1) reviewed the supply chain risk for the information systems against criteria developed by NIST to inform acquisition decisions for high-impact and moderate-impact information systems within the Federal Government;

(2) reviewed the supply chain risk from the presumptive awardee against available and relevant threat information provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other appropriate agencies; and

(3) in consultation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other appropriate Federal entity, conducted an assessment of any risk of cyber-espionage or sabotage associated with the acquisition of such system, including any risk associated with such system being produced, manufactured, or assembled by one or more entities identified by the United States Government as posing a cyber threat, including but not limited to, those that may be owned, directed, or subsidized by the People's Republic of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or the Russian Federation.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to acquire a high-impact or moderate impact information system reviewed and assessed under subsection (a) unless the head of the assessing entity described in subsection (a) has—

(1) developed, in consultation with NIST and supply chain risk management experts, a mitigation strategy for any identified risks;

(2) determined, in consultation with NIST and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the acquisition of such system is in the vital national security interest of the United States; and

(3) reported that determination to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in a manner that identifies the system intended for acquisition and a detailed description of the

mitigation strategies identified in (1), provided that such report may include a classified annex as necessary.

SEC. 633. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for airline accommodations for any officer (as defined in section 2104 of title 5, United States Code) or employee (as defined in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code) in the executive branch that are not coach-class accommodations (which term is defined, for purposes of this section, as the basic class of accommodation by airlines that is normally the lowest fare offered regardless of airline terminology used, and (as referred to by airlines) may include tourist class or economy class, as well as single class when the airline offers only one class of accommodations to all travelers), unless such accommodations are consistent with section 301–10.123 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act) and, with respect to subsection (a)(3) and (b)(2) of such section, written authorization is provided by the head of the agency (or, if the accommodations are for the head of the agency, by the Inspector General of the agency).

SEC. 634. The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with relevant regulators, shall conduct a study that—

(1) examines the financial impact of the mineral pyrrhotite in concrete home foundations; and

(2) provides recommendations on regulatory and legislative actions needed to help mitigate the financial impact described in paragraph (1) on banks, mortgage lenders, tax revenues, and homeowners.

SEC. 635. The explanatory statement regarding division B of H.R. 21, printed in the Congressional Record on January 3, 2019, and submitted by the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, shall have the same effect with respect to allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

SEC. 636. (a) Employees furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations beginning on or about December 22, 2018 and ending on the date of enactment of this Act shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation, for the period of such lapse in appropriations, as soon as practicable after such lapse in appropriations ends.

(b) For purposes of this section, “employee” means any of the following whose salaries and expenses are provided in this Act:

(1) A Federal employee.

(2) An employee of the District of Columbia Courts.

(3) An employee of the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia.

(4) A District of Columbia Government employee.

(c) All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations made and authority granted by this Act for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of activity to protect life and property and bringing about orderly termination of Government functions, and for purposes as otherwise authorized by law, are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 637. (a) If a State (or another Federal grantee) used State funds (or the grantee’s non-Federal funds) to continue carrying out a Federal program or furloughed State employees (or the grantee’s employees) whose compensation is advanced or reimbursed in whole or in part by the Federal Government—

(1) such furloughed employees shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation for such period;

(2) the State (or such other grantee) shall be reimbursed for expenses that would have

been paid by the Federal Government during such period had appropriations been available, including the cost of compensating such furloughed employees, together with interest thereon calculated under section 6503(d) of title 31, United States Code; and

(3) the State (or such other grantee) may use funds available to the State (or the grantee) under such Federal program to reimburse such State (or the grantee), together with interest thereon calculated under section 6503(d) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term “State” and the term “grantee,” including United States territories and possessions, shall have the meaning given such terms under the applicable Federal program under subsection (a). In addition, “to continue carrying out a Federal program” means the continued performance by a State or other Federal grantee, during the period of a lapse in appropriations, of a Federal program that the State or such other grantee had been carrying out prior to the period of the lapse in appropriations.

(c) The authority under this section applies with respect to any period in fiscal year 2019 (not limited to periods beginning or ending after the date of the enactment of this Act) during which there occurs a lapse in appropriations with respect to any department or agency of the Federal Government receiving funding in this Act which, but for such lapse in appropriations, would have paid, or made reimbursement relating to, any of the expenses referred to in this section with respect to the program involved. Payments and reimbursements under this authority shall be made only to the extent and in amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS—GOVERNMENT-WIDE

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this or any other Act for fiscal year 2019 shall obligate or expend any such funds, unless such department, agency, or instrumentality has in place, and will continue to administer in good faith, a written policy designed to ensure that all of its workplaces are free from the illegal use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances (as defined in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)) by the officers and employees of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

SEC. 702. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with subsection 1343(c) of title 31, United States Code, for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses, ambulances, law enforcement vehicles, protective vehicles, and undercover surveillance vehicles), is hereby fixed at \$19,947 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be \$19,997: *Provided*, That these limits may be exceeded by not to exceed \$7,250 for police-type vehicles: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section may not be exceeded by more than 5 percent for electric or hybrid vehicles purchased for demonstration under the provisions of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this section may be exceeded by the incremental cost of clean alternative fuels vehicles acquired pursuant to Public Law 101–549 over the cost of comparable conventionally fueled vehicles: *Provided further*, That the limits set forth in this

section shall not apply to any vehicle that is a commercial item and which operates on alternative fuel, including but not limited to electric, plug-in hybrid electric, and hydrogen fuel cell vehicles.

SEC. 703. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year available for expenses of travel, or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 5922–5924.

SEC. 704. Unless otherwise specified in law during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in the continental United States unless such person: (1) is a citizen of the United States; (2) is a person who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence and is seeking citizenship as outlined in 8 U.S.C. 1324b(a)(3)(B); (3) is a person who is admitted as a refugee under 8 U.S.C. 1157 or is granted asylum under 8 U.S.C. 1158 and has filed a declaration of intention to become a lawful permanent resident and then a citizen when eligible; or (4) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, affidavits signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his or her status are being complied with: *Provided further*, That for purposes of subsections (2) and (3) such affidavits shall be submitted prior to employment and updated thereafter as necessary: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction, shall be fined no more than \$4,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to any person who is an officer or employee of the Government of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, or to international broadcasters employed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed 60 days) as a result of emergencies: *Provided further*, That this section does not apply to the employment as Wildland firefighters for not more than 120 days of nonresident aliens employed by the Department of the Interior or the USDA Forest Service pursuant to an agreement with another country.

SEC. 705. Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for payment to the General Services Administration for charges for space and services and those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 216), or other applicable law.

SEC. 706. In addition to funds provided in this or any other Act, all Federal agencies are authorized to receive and use funds resulting from the sale of materials, including Federal records disposed of pursuant to a records schedule recovered through recycling or waste prevention programs. Such funds

shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

(1) Acquisition, waste reduction and prevention, and recycling programs as described in Executive Order No. 13693 (March 19, 2015), including any such programs adopted prior to the effective date of the Executive order.

(2) Other Federal agency environmental management programs, including, but not limited to, the development and implementation of hazardous waste management and pollution prevention programs.

(3) Other employee programs as authorized by law or as deemed appropriate by the head of the Federal agency.

SEC. 707. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to chapter 91 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109; and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 708. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for interagency financing of boards (except Federal Executive Boards), commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups (whether or not they are interagency entities) which do not have a prior and specific statutory approval to receive financial support from more than one agency or instrumentality.

SEC. 709. None of the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this or any other Act shall be used to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a joint resolution duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

SEC. 710. During the period in which the head of any department or agency, or any other officer or civilian employee of the Federal Government appointed by the President of the United States, holds office, no funds may be obligated or expended in excess of \$5,000 to furnish or redecorate the office of such department head, agency head, officer, or employee, or to purchase furniture or make improvements for any such office, unless advance notice of such furnishing or redecoration is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. For the purposes of this section, the term "office" shall include the entire suite of offices assigned to the individual, as well as any other space used primarily by the individual or the use of which is directly controlled by the individual.

SEC. 711. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act shall be available for the interagency funding of national security and emergency preparedness telecommunications initiatives which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities, as provided by Executive Order No. 13618 (July 6, 2012).

SEC. 712. (a) None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government to pay the salaries or expenses of any individual appointed to a position of a confidential or policy-determining character that is excepted from the competitive service under section 3302 of title 5, United

States Code, (pursuant to schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations) unless the head of the applicable department, agency, or other instrumentality employing such schedule C individual certifies to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management that the schedule C position occupied by the individual was not created solely or primarily in order to detail the individual to the White House.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to Federal employees or members of the armed forces detailed to or from an element of the intelligence community (as that term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))).

SEC. 713. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be available for the payment of the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Government, who—

(1) prohibits or prevents, or attempts or threatens to prohibit or prevent, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government from having any direct oral or written communication or contact with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress in connection with any matter pertaining to the employment of such other officer or employee or pertaining to the department or agency of such other officer or employee in any way, irrespective of whether such communication or contact is at the initiative of such other officer or employee or in response to the request or inquiry of such Member, committee, or subcommittee; or

(2) removes, suspends from duty without pay, demotes, reduces in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance or efficiency rating, denies promotion to, relocates, reassigns, transfers, disciplines, or discriminates in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government, or attempts or threatens to commit any of the foregoing actions with respect to such other officer or employee, by reason of any communication or contact of such other officer or employee with any Member, committee, or subcommittee of the Congress as described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 714. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training that—

(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;

(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;

(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;

(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-915.022, dated September 2, 1988; or

(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

SEC. 715. No part of any funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, dis-

tribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 716. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be used by an agency to provide a Federal employee's home address to any labor organization except when the employee has authorized such disclosure or when such disclosure has been ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 717. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to provide any non-public information such as mailing, telephone or electronic mailing lists to any person or any organization outside of the Federal Government without the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 718. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used directly or indirectly, including by private contractor, for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by Congress.

SEC. 719. (a) In this section, the term "agency"—

(1) means an Executive agency, as defined under 5 U.S.C. 105; and

(2) includes a military department, as defined under section 102 of such title, the United States Postal Service, and the Postal Regulatory Commission.

(b) Unless authorized in accordance with law or regulations to use such time for other purposes, an employee of an agency shall use official time in an honest effort to perform official duties. An employee not under a leave system, including a Presidential appointee exempted under 5 U.S.C. 6301(2), has an obligation to expend an honest effort and a reasonable proportion of such employee's time in the performance of official duties.

SEC. 720. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act to any department or agency, which is a member of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB), shall be available to finance an appropriate share of FASAB administrative costs.

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346 and section 708 of this Act, the head of each Executive department and agency is hereby authorized to transfer to or reimburse "General Services Administration, Government-wide Policy" with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act, including rebates from charge card and other contracts: *Provided*, That these funds shall be administered by the Administrator of General Services to support Government-wide and other multi-agency financial, information technology, procurement, and other management innovations, initiatives, and activities, including improving coordination and reducing duplication, as approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the appropriate interagency and multi-agency groups designated by the Director (including the President's Management Council for overall management improvement initiatives, the Chief Financial Officers Council for financial management initiatives, the Chief Information Officers Council for information technology initiatives, the Chief Human Capital Officers Council for human capital initiatives, the Chief Acquisition Officers Council for procurement initiatives, and the Performance Improvement Council for performance improvement initiatives): *Provided further*, That the total funds transferred or reimbursed shall not exceed \$15,000,000 to improve

coordination, reduce duplication, and for other activities related to Federal Government Priority Goals established by 31 U.S.C. 1120, and not to exceed \$17,000,000 for Government-Wide innovations, initiatives, and activities: *Provided further*, That the funds transferred to or for reimbursement of “General Services Administration, Government-wide Policy” during fiscal year 2019 shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That such transfers or reimbursements may only be made after 15 days following notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SEC. 722. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a woman may breastfeed her child at any location in a Federal building or on Federal property, if the woman and her child are otherwise authorized to be present at the location.

SEC. 723. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1346, or section 708 of this Act, funds made available for the current fiscal year by this or any other Act shall be available for the inter-agency funding of specific projects, workshops, studies, and similar efforts to carry out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Council (authorized by Executive Order No. 12881), which benefit multiple Federal departments, agencies, or entities: *Provided*, That the Office of Management and Budget shall provide a report describing the budget of and resources connected with the National Science and Technology Council to the Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Science and Technology, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 90 days after enactment of this Act.

SEC. 724. Any request for proposals, solicitation, grant application, form, notification, press release, or other publications involving the distribution of Federal funds shall comply with any relevant requirements in part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations: *Provided*, That this section shall apply to direct payments, formula funds, and grants received by a State receiving Federal funds.

SEC. 725. (a) PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY MONITORING OF INDIVIDUALS’ INTERNET USE.—None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by any Federal agency—

(1) to collect, review, or create any aggregation of data, derived from any means, that includes any personally identifiable information relating to an individual’s access to or use of any Federal Government Internet site of the agency; or

(2) to enter into any agreement with a third party (including another government agency) to collect, review, or obtain any aggregation of data, derived from any means, that includes any personally identifiable information relating to an individual’s access to or use of any nongovernmental Internet site.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitations established in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any record of aggregate data that does not identify particular persons;

(2) any voluntary submission of personally identifiable information;

(3) any action taken for law enforcement, regulatory, or supervisory purposes, in accordance with applicable law; or

(4) any action described in subsection (a)(1) that is a system security action taken by the operator of an Internet site and is necessarily incident to providing the Internet site services or to protecting the rights or property of the provider of the Internet site.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term “regulatory” means agency actions to implement, interpret or enforce authorities provided in law.

(2) The term “supervisory” means examinations of the agency’s supervised institutions, including assessing safety and soundness, overall financial condition, management practices and policies and compliance with applicable standards as provided in law.

SEC. 726. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enter into or renew a contract which includes a provision providing prescription drug coverage, except where the contract also includes a provision for contraceptive coverage.

(b) Nothing in this section shall apply to a contract with—

(1) any of the following religious plans:

(A) Personal Care’s HMO; and

(B) OSF HealthPlans, Inc.; and

(2) any existing or future plan, if the carrier for the plan objects to such coverage on the basis of religious beliefs.

(c) In implementing this section, any plan that enters into or renews a contract under this section may not subject any individual to discrimination on the basis that the individual refuses to prescribe or otherwise provide for contraceptives because such activities would be contrary to the individual’s religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require coverage of abortion or abortion-related services.

SEC. 727. The United States is committed to ensuring the health of its Olympic, Pan American, and Paralympic athletes, and supports the strict adherence to anti-doping in sport through testing, adjudication, education, and research as performed by nationally recognized oversight authorities.

SEC. 728. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for official travel to Federal departments and agencies may be used by such departments and agencies, if consistent with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–126 regarding official travel for Government personnel, to participate in the fractional aircraft ownership pilot program.

SEC. 729. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this or any other appropriations Act may be used to implement or enforce restrictions or limitations on the Coast Guard Congressional Fellowship Program, or to implement the proposed regulations of the Office of Personnel Management to add sections 300.311 through 300.316 to part 300 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, published in the Federal Register, volume 68, number 174, on September 9, 2003 (relating to the detail of executive branch employees to the legislative branch).

SEC. 730. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no executive branch agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training which cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 731. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States, unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was

prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 732. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 552a of title 5, United States Code (popularly known as the Privacy Act), and regulations implementing that section.

SEC. 733. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used for any Federal Government contract with any foreign incorporated entity which is treated as an inverted domestic corporation under section 835(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(b)) or any subsidiary of such an entity.

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any Secretary shall waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such Secretary if the Secretary determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Any Secretary issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall report such issuance to Congress.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to any Federal Government contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act, or to any task order issued pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 734. During fiscal year 2019, for each employee who—

(1) retires under section 8336(d)(2) or 8414(b)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) retires under any other provision of subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of such title 5 and receives a payment as an incentive to separate, the separating agency shall remit to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to the Office of Personnel Management’s average unit cost of processing a retirement claim for the preceding fiscal year. Such amounts shall be available until expended to the Office of Personnel Management and shall be deemed to be an administrative expense under section 8348(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 735. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to recommend or require any entity submitting an offer for a Federal contract to disclose any of the following information as a condition of submitting the offer:

(1) Any payment consisting of a contribution, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement for an electioneering communication that is made by the entity, its officers or directors, or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries to a candidate for election for Federal office or to a political committee, or that is otherwise made with respect to any election for Federal office.

(2) Any disbursement of funds (other than a payment described in paragraph (1)) made by the entity, its officers or directors, or any of its affiliates or subsidiaries to any person with the intent or the reasonable expectation that the person will use the funds to make a payment described in paragraph (1).

(b) In this section, each of the terms “contribution”, “expenditure”, “independent expenditure”, “electioneering communication”, “candidate”, “election”, and “Federal office” has the meaning given such term in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.).

SEC. 736. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay for the painting of a portrait of an officer or employee of the Federal government, including the President, the Vice President, a member of Congress (including a Delegate or a Resident Commissioner to Congress), the head of an executive branch agency (as defined in section 133 of title 41, United States Code), or the head of an office of the legislative branch.

SEC. 737. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this section, no part of any of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2019, by this or any other Act, may be used to pay any prevailing rate employee described in section 5342(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code—

(A) during the period from the date of expiration of the limitation imposed by the comparable section for the previous fiscal years until the normal effective date of the applicable wage survey adjustment that is to take effect in fiscal year 2019, in an amount that exceeds the rate payable for the applicable grade and step of the applicable wage schedule in accordance with such section; and

(B) during the period consisting of the remainder of fiscal year 2019, in an amount that exceeds, as a result of a wage survey adjustment, the rate payable under subparagraph (A) by more than the sum of—

(i) the percentage adjustment taking effect in fiscal year 2019 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule; and

(ii) the difference between the overall average percentage of the locality-based comparability payments taking effect in fiscal year 2019 under section 5304 of such title (whether by adjustment or otherwise), and the overall average percentage of such payments which was effective in the previous fiscal year under such section.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no prevailing rate employee described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 5342(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, and no employee covered by section 5348 of such title, may be paid during the periods for which paragraph (1) is in effect at a rate that exceeds the rates that would be payable under paragraph (1) were paragraph (1) applicable to such employee.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the rates payable to an employee who is covered by this subsection and who is paid from a schedule not in existence on September 30, 2018, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rates of premium pay for employees subject to this subsection may not be changed from the rates in effect on September 30, 2018, except to the extent determined by the Office of Personnel Management to be consistent with the purpose of this subsection.

(5) This subsection shall apply with respect to pay for service performed after September 30, 2018.

(6) For the purpose of administering any provision of law (including any rule or regulation that provides premium pay, retirement, life insurance, or any other employee benefit) that requires any deduction or contribution, or that imposes any requirement or limitation on the basis of a rate of salary or basic pay, the rate of salary or basic pay payable after the application of this subsection shall be treated as the rate of salary or basic pay.

(7) Nothing in this subsection shall be considered to permit or require the payment to any employee covered by this subsection at a rate in excess of the rate that would be payable were this subsection not in effect.

(8) The Office of Personnel Management may provide for exceptions to the limitations imposed by this subsection if the Office determines that such exceptions are necessary to ensure the recruitment or retention of qualified employees.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the adjustment in rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems that take place in fiscal year 2019 under sections 5344 and 5348 of title 5, United States Code, shall be—

(1) not less than the percentage received by employees in the same location whose rates of basic pay are adjusted pursuant to the statutory pay systems under sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided*, That prevailing rate employees at locations where there are no employees whose pay is increased pursuant to sections 5303 and 5304 of title 5, United States Code, and prevailing rate employees described in section 5343(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to be located in the pay locality designated as “Rest of United States” pursuant to section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of this subsection; and

(2) effective as of the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 738. (a) The Vice President may not receive a pay raise in calendar year 2019, notwithstanding the rate adjustment made under section 104 of title 3, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

(b) An employee serving in an Executive Schedule position, or in a position for which the rate of pay is fixed by statute at an Executive Schedule rate, may not receive a pay rate increase in calendar year 2019, notwithstanding schedule adjustments made under section 5318 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law, except as provided in subsection (g), (h), or (i). This subsection applies only to employees who are holding a position under a political appointment.

(c) A chief of mission or ambassador at large may not receive a pay rate increase in calendar year 2019, notwithstanding section 401 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-465) or any other provision of law, except as provided in subsection (g), (h), or (i).

(d) Notwithstanding sections 5382 and 5383 of title 5, United States Code, a pay rate increase may not be received in calendar year 2019 (except as provided in subsection (g), (h), or (i)) by—

(1) a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service paid a rate of basic pay at or above level IV of the Executive Schedule; or

(2) a limited term appointee or limited emergency appointee in the Senior Executive Service serving under a political appointment and paid a rate of basic pay at or above level IV of the Executive Schedule.

(e) Any employee paid a rate of basic pay (including any locality-based payments under section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, or similar authority) at or above level IV of the Executive Schedule who serves under a political appointment may not receive a pay rate increase in calendar year 2019, notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subsection (g), (h), or (i). This subsection does not apply to employees in the General Schedule pay system or the Foreign Service pay system, or to employees appointed under section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, or to employees in another pay system whose position would be classified at GS-15 or below if chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, applied to them.

(f) Nothing in subsections (b) through (e) shall prevent employees who do not serve under a political appointment from receiving pay increases as otherwise provided under applicable law.

(g) A career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who receives a Presidential appointment and who makes an election to retain Senior Executive Service basic pay entitlements under section 3392 of title 5, United States Code, is not subject to this section.

(h) A member of the Senior Foreign Service who receives a Presidential appointment to any position in the executive branch and who makes an election to retain Senior Foreign Service pay entitlements under section

302(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-465) is not subject to this section.

(i) Notwithstanding subsections (b) through (e), an employee in a covered position may receive a pay rate increase upon an authorized movement to a different covered position with higher-level duties and a pre-established higher level or range of pay, except that any such increase must be based on the rates of pay and applicable pay limitations in effect on December 31, 2013.

(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for an individual who is newly appointed to a covered position during the period of time subject to this section, the initial pay rate shall be based on the rates of pay and applicable pay limitations in effect on December 31, 2013.

(k) If an employee affected by subsections (b) through (e) is subject to a biweekly pay period that begins in calendar year 2019 but ends in calendar year 2020, the bar on the employee's receipt of pay rate increases shall apply through the end of that pay period.

SEC. 739. (a) The head of any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act shall submit annual reports to the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, regarding the costs and contracting procedures related to each conference held by any such department, agency, board, commission, or office during fiscal year 2019 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than \$100,000.

(b) Each report submitted shall include, for each conference described in subsection (a) held during the applicable period—

(1) a description of its purpose;

(2) the number of participants attending;

(3) a detailed statement of the costs to the United States Government, including—

(A) the cost of any food or beverages;

(B) the cost of any audio-visual services;

(C) the cost of employee or contractor travel to and from the conference; and

(D) a discussion of the methodology used to determine which costs relate to the conference; and

(4) a description of the contracting procedures used including—

(A) whether contracts were awarded on a competitive basis; and

(B) a discussion of any cost comparison conducted by the departmental component or office in evaluating potential contractors for the conference.

(c) Within 15 days after the end of a quarter, the head of any such department, agency, board, commission, or office shall notify the Inspector General or senior ethics official for any entity without an Inspector General, of the date, location, and number of employees attending a conference held by any Executive branch department, agency, board, commission, or office funded by this or any other appropriations Act during fiscal year 2019 for which the cost to the United States Government was more than \$20,000.

(d) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this or any other appropriations Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a conference described in subsection (c) that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(e) None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used for travel and conference activities that are not in compliance with Office of Management and Budget Memorandum M-12-12 dated May 11, 2012 or any subsequent revisions to that memorandum.

SEC. 740. None of the funds made available in this or any other appropriations Act may be used to increase, eliminate, or reduce funding for a program, project, or activity as proposed in the President's budget request for a fiscal year until such proposed change is subsequently enacted in an appropriation Act, or unless such change is made pursuant to the reprogramming or transfer provisions of this or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 741. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or apply the rule entitled "Competitive Area" published by the Office of Personnel Management in the Federal Register on April 15, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 20180 et seq.).

SEC. 742. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to begin or announce a study or public-private competition regarding the conversion to contractor performance of any function performed by Federal employees pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 or any other administrative regulation, directive, or policy.

SEC. 743. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be available for a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with an entity that requires employees or contractors of such entity seeking to report fraud, waste, or abuse to sign internal confidentiality agreements or statements prohibiting or otherwise restricting such employees or contractors from lawfully reporting such waste, fraud, or abuse to a designated investigative or law enforcement representative of a Federal department or agency authorized to receive such information.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not contravene requirements applicable to Standard Form 312, Form 4414, or any other form issued by a Federal department or agency governing the nondisclosure of classified information.

SEC. 744. (a) No funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce the agreements in Standard Forms 312 and 4414 of the Government or any other nondisclosure policy, form, or agreement if such policy, form, or agreement does not contain the following provisions: "These provisions are consistent with and do not supersede, conflict with, or otherwise alter the employee obligations, rights, or liabilities created by existing statute or Executive order relating to (1) classified information, (2) communications to Congress, (3) the reporting to an Inspector General of a violation of any law, rule, or regulation, or mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or (4) any other whistleblower protection. The definitions, requirements, obligations, rights, sanctions, and liabilities created by controlling Executive orders and statutory provisions are incorporated into this agreement and are controlling." *Provided*, That notwithstanding the preceding provision of this section, a nondisclosure policy form or agreement that is to be executed by a person connected with the conduct of an intelligence or intelligence-related activity, other than an employee or officer of the United States Government, may contain provisions appropriate to the particular activity for which such document is to be used. Such form or agreement shall, at a minimum, require that the person will not disclose any classified information received in the course of such activity unless specifically authorized to do so by the United States Government. Such nondisclosure forms shall also make it clear that they do not bar disclosures to Congress, or to an authorized offi-

cial of an executive agency or the Department of Justice, that are essential to reporting a substantial violation of law.

(b) A nondisclosure agreement may continue to be implemented and enforced notwithstanding subsection (a) if it complies with the requirements for such agreement that were in effect when the agreement was entered into.

(c) No funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce any agreement entered into during fiscal year 2014 which does not contain substantially similar language to that required in subsection (a).

SEC. 745. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless a Federal agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 746. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless a Federal agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 747. (a) During fiscal year 2019, on the date on which a request is made for a transfer of funds in accordance with section 1017 of Public Law 111-203, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate of such request.

(b) Any notification required by this section shall be made available on the Bureau's public Web site.

SEC. 748. If, for fiscal year 2019, new budget authority provided in appropriations Acts exceeds the discretionary spending limit for any category set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 due to estimating differences with the Congressional Budget Office, an adjustment to the discretionary spending limit in such category for fiscal year 2019 shall be made by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the amount of the excess but the total of all such adjustments shall not exceed 0.2 percent of the sum of the adjusted discretionary spending limits for all categories for that fiscal year.

SEC. 749. (a) The adjustment in rates of basic pay for employees under the statutory pay systems that takes effect in fiscal year 2019 under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, shall be an increase of 1.4 percent, and the overall average percentage of the adjustments taking effect in such fiscal year under sections 5304 and 5304a of such title 5 shall be an increase of 0.5 percent (with comparability payments to be deter-

mined and allocated among pay localities by the President). All adjustments under this subsection shall be effective as of the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2019.

(b) Notwithstanding section 737, the adjustment in rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems that take place in fiscal year 2019 under sections 5344 and 5348 of title 5, United States Code, shall be no less than the percentages in subsection (a) as employees in the same location whose rates of basic pay are adjusted pursuant to the statutory pay systems under section 5303, 5304, and 5304a of title 5, United States Code. Prevailing rate employees at locations where there are no employees whose pay is increased pursuant to sections 5303, 5304, and 5304a of such title 5 and prevailing rate employees described in section 5343(a)(5) of such title 5 shall be considered to be located in the pay locality designated as "Rest of U.S." pursuant to section 5304 of such title 5 for purposes of this subsection.

(c) Funds used to carry out this section shall be paid from appropriations, which are made to each applicable department or agency for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2019.

SEC. 750. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to "this Act" contained in any title other than title IV or VIII shall not apply to such title IV or VIII.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 801. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of legal settlements or judgments that have been entered against the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 802. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 803. (a) None of the Federal funds provided under this Act to the agencies funded by this Act, both Federal and District government agencies, that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2019, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditures for an agency through a reprogramming of funds which—

- (1) creates new programs;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, or responsibility center;
- (3) establishes or changes allocations specifically denied, limited or increased under this Act;
- (4) increases funds or personnel by any means for any program, project, or responsibility center for which funds have been denied or restricted;
- (5) re-establishes any program or project previously deferred through reprogramming;
- (6) augments any existing program, project, or responsibility center through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$3,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or
- (7) increases by 20 percent or more personnel assigned to a specific program, project or responsibility center, unless prior approval is received from the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(b) The District of Columbia government is authorized to approve and execute reprogramming and transfer requests of local funds under this title through November 7, 2019.

SEC. 804. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senator or United States Representative under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiatives of 1979 (D.C. Law 3-171; D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-123).

SEC. 805. Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds made available by this Act or by any other Act may be used to provide any officer or employee of the District of Columbia with an official vehicle unless the officer or employee uses the vehicle only in the performance of the officer's or employee's official duties. For purposes of this section, the term "official duties" does not include travel between the officer's or employee's residence and workplace, except in the case of—

(1) an officer or employee of the Metropolitan Police Department who resides in the District of Columbia or is otherwise designated by the Chief of the Department;

(2) at the discretion of the Fire Chief, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(3) at the discretion of the Director of the Department of Corrections, an officer or employee of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(4) at the discretion of the Chief Medical Examiner, an officer or employee of the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(5) at the discretion of the Director of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency, an officer or employee of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency who resides in the District of Columbia and is on call 24 hours a day;

(6) the Mayor of the District of Columbia; and

(7) the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 806. (a) None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia Attorney General or any other officer or entity of the District government to provide assistance for any petition drive or civil action which seeks to require Congress to provide for voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia.

(b) Nothing in this section bars the District of Columbia Attorney General from reviewing or commenting on briefs in private lawsuits, or from consulting with officials of the District government regarding such lawsuits.

SEC. 807. None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to distribute any needle or syringe for the purpose of preventing the spread of blood borne pathogens in any location that has been determined by the local public health or local law enforcement authorities to be inappropriate for such distribution.

SEC. 808. Nothing in this Act may be construed to prevent the Council or Mayor of the District of Columbia from addressing the issue of the provision of contraceptive coverage by health insurance plans, but it is the intent of Congress that any legislation enacted on such issue should include a "conscience clause" which provides exceptions for religious beliefs and moral convictions.

SEC. 809. (a) None of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution

of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative.

(b) No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority may be used to enact any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or any tetrahydrocannabinols derivative for recreational purposes.

SEC. 810. No funds available for obligation or expenditure by the District of Columbia government under any authority shall be expended for any abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or where the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 811. (a) No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the Council of the District of Columbia, a revised appropriated funds operating budget in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-204.42), for all agencies of the District of Columbia government for fiscal year 2019 that is in the total amount of the approved appropriation and that realigns all budgeted data for personal services and other-than-personal services, respectively, with anticipated actual expenditures.

(b) This section shall apply only to an agency for which the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia certifies that a reallocation is required to address unanticipated changes in program requirements.

SEC. 812. No later than 30 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Mayor, and the Council for the District of Columbia, a revised appropriated funds operating budget for the District of Columbia Public Schools that aligns schools budgets to actual enrollment. The revised appropriated funds budget shall be in the format of the budget that the District of Columbia government submitted pursuant to section 442 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (D.C. Official Code, sec. 1-204.42).

SEC. 813. (a) Amounts appropriated in this Act as operating funds may be transferred to the District of Columbia's enterprise and capital funds and such amounts, once transferred, shall retain appropriation authority consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(b) The District of Columbia government is authorized to reprogram or transfer for operating expenses any local funds transferred or reprogrammed in this or the four prior fiscal years from operating funds to capital funds, and such amounts, once transferred or reprogrammed, shall retain appropriation authority consistent with the provisions of this Act.

(c) The District of Columbia government may not transfer or reprogram for operating expenses any funds derived from bonds, notes, or other obligations issued for capital projects.

SEC. 814. None of the Federal funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 815. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law or under this Act, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances re-

maining available at the end of fiscal year 2019 from appropriations of Federal funds made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2019 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2020, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines outlined in section 803 of this Act.

SEC. 816. (a)(1) During fiscal year 2020, during a period in which neither a District of Columbia continuing resolution or a regular District of Columbia appropriation bill is in effect, local funds are appropriated in the amount provided for any project or activity for which local funds are provided in the Act referred to in paragraph (2) (subject to any modifications enacted by the District of Columbia as of the beginning of the period during which this subsection is in effect) at the rate set forth by such Act.

(2) The Act referred to in this paragraph is the Act of the Council of the District of Columbia pursuant to which a proposed budget is approved for fiscal year 2020 which (subject to the requirements of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act) will constitute the local portion of the annual budget for the District of Columbia government for fiscal year 2020 for purposes of section 446 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-204.46, D.C. Official Code).

(b) Appropriations made by subsection (a) shall cease to be available—

(1) during any period in which a District of Columbia continuing resolution for fiscal year 2020 is in effect; or

(2) upon the enactment into law of the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 2020.

(c) An appropriation made by subsection (a) is provided under the authority and conditions as provided under this Act and shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by this Act.

(d) An appropriation made by subsection (a) shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for such project or activity during the portion of fiscal year 2020 for which this section applies to such project or activity.

(e) This section shall not apply to a project or activity during any period of fiscal year 2020 if any other provision of law (other than an authorization of appropriations)—

(1) makes an appropriation, makes funds available, or grants authority for such project or activity to continue for such period; or

(2) specifically provides that no appropriation shall be made, no funds shall be made available, or no authority shall be granted for such project or activity to continue for such period.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect obligations of the government of the District of Columbia mandated by other law.

SEC. 817. Except as expressly provided otherwise, any reference to "this Act" contained in this title or in title IV shall be treated as referring only to the provisions of this title or of title IV.

This Act may be cited as the "Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. QUIGLEY. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Now that Democrats have taken the majority in the House, we have shown our intention to govern responsibly and have already illustrated real leadership at every turn, a welcome change after fighting through 2 years of chaos and obstruction, which culminated in a reckless shutdown.

At the end of the day, the President's beloved border wall is the issue solely responsible for this irresponsible shutdown, and it is an absolute disgrace and a disservice to all Americans to allow this broken campaign promise to hold all other key funding bills hostage.

From delays in the processing of Federal loan assistance applications for small businesses and the uncertainty created for taxpayers during tax season, to regulatory agencies like the FTC not being able to pursue the vast majority of consumer protection investigations, I have seen firsthand how this shutdown is impacting the communities around the country, as the chairman-designate of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Due to the shutdown at the SEC, companies have been announcing delays, and investors are concerned that IPOs for companies such as Uber will miss a key first quarter deadline.

We can put a stop to this chaos that is rattling our communities and our economy. This bill before us today is fiscally responsible and makes hard choices among competing priorities. It provides a total of \$23.688 billion in discretionary resources, an increase of \$265 million over the fiscal year 2018 level.

The bill rejects the President's proposed elimination of the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund and cuts to the Small Business Administration, which provides necessary resources to spur economic growth, particularly in underserved communities.

The bill provides a pay increase for civilian Federal employees in 2019, while putting a stop to the excessive raises to the Vice President and other high-ranking administration officials.

In addition, the bill includes backpay for Federal employees furloughed during this shutdown.

One key feature of this bill is the total lack of controversial policy riders. This is a clean appropriations measure squarely under the jurisdiction of this committee.

Again, most importantly, this bill will reopen the Department of the Treasury, which includes the IRS as well as the Securities and Exchange Commission, Small Business Administration, and multiple other agencies that have a direct impact on the lives and livelihoods of American families, businesses, and communities.

By passing this bill, we will be able to get more than 130,000 workers back to work and receiving a paycheck. It is long past time that we reopen government, and this bill does exactly that for a number of critical agencies that Americans rely on every day.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this bill today because this is just another one of the Democrat Party's political stunts.

The 116th Congress continues now under this cloud of a partial government shutdown, and it is for one reason and one reason only, and that is that the Democrats continue to put their political agenda ahead of the security of our country.

So here we find ourselves, the very first act of the new majority is to bring a Senate bill forward without any hearings, without any debate, and certainly without any amendments.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Democrats that bring the bills to the floor this week are really bypassing the entire process, bypassing every Member's responsibility here in Congress, and that is to put their mark on each and every bill.

It also may be to distract from some of the President's ideas as well. In fact, the President's funding request is completely normal, and it is necessary. It is not extreme. It is not divisive. It is not political in any way whatsoever.

What is extreme, what is divisive, what is political, and what is unnecessary is the Democrats' refusal to actually negotiate with the President, their refusal to hear the facts and understand the facts as presented by the experts.

They are more committed to satisfying their political base than securing the border and opening the government, which we could do very quickly if they just chose to meet with the President and negotiate on good terms and in good faith.

If that is not bad enough, there are serious problems with this bill. The underlying measure itself is certainly not perfect. After all, it is a Senate bill, might I remind you, Mr. Speaker. It is identical to the bill that they passed last year, and it does not include any of the House priorities.

Democrats are not allowing any amendments here today, so there is no

way even to improve this bill, to perfect this bill, and we know we are the body of perfecting the Senate's legislation.

Our constituents have elected us each here to represent them in Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, not to abdicate our responsibilities and simply accept something from the Senate.

In fact, today is beginning a process that I see as very dangerous and, in fact, is just asking this body, under this new majority, to have every Member of the House of Representatives vote on nearly \$300-plus billion of spending without one committee hearing, without one bit of debate, without one amendment, and without any bit of perfection, and, yet, stand before our constituents and say we have given this full and thorough thought.

Now, there are many House priorities that both Democrats and Republicans support that would certainly improve this legislation. For example, the bill that we passed out of the House last year had many great bipartisan elements to it. We passed it back in July, and it contained nearly \$276 million for the Calexico, California, land port of entry, fully funding what was necessary there at that land port of entry. Yet, the Senate bill is \$100 million short.

Additionally, the bill that passed the House last year included 20 pieces of legislation that were bipartisan financial reforms that were approved by this Chamber during the last Congress with a vote of 270 votes or more.

Mr. Speaker, you don't find that very often and you certainly haven't over the last couple of years, yet it was included in what we passed last year. Might I add, it is completely omitted by the Senate.

So Democrats and Republicans, including Chairwoman WATERS herself, sponsored many of these provisions—I know she is here with us today, and I hope she speaks to the fact of their absence in this bill today—that were building upon the JOBS Act from 2012.

These provisions facilitated capital formation, enhanced our capital markets, and provided targeted relief to various institutions. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, it provided consumer protection, which I think and I would hope is a bipartisan quest for us.

The Senate bill also shorts the Small Business Administration's Entrepreneurial Development programs, something that has been bipartisan in this House. They short it by more than \$10 million compared to what we passed last year. It shorts the SBA's Women's Business Centers by \$1 million and their veterans outreach by \$400,000.

Mr. Speaker, those are things we included last year that the Senate has found are not a priority. The question I would have before this House today is: Do we no longer hold those as priorities?

If we pass what is proposed today, we are, in fact, saying it is no longer a priority that we focus on veterans' or on women's businesses.

If that is not bad enough, the Senate bill is more than \$31 million short on SBA's disaster loans program. Many areas of this country, including my State, including many of the States represented in this room as we speak, are still reeling from last year's disasters. So do Democrats really want to cut this lifeline short?

Mr. Speaker, I would hope not.

By abandoning the bipartisan House bill, Democrats are underfunding programs for women, veterans, and disaster victims.

Additionally, this Senate bill contains nothing—and I say, Mr. Speaker, nothing—for community development financial institutions to assist those with disabilities.

Are we standing here today, Mr. Speaker, and saying that those with disabilities are no longer a priority of this House? A "yes" vote today would confirm that.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am certainly not supporting this bill.

But I know that I have worked with my friend, Mr. QUIGLEY, who is now the chairperson, and we are going to have a great working relationship. But this Senate bill is deficient of even his priorities.

I know it is very difficult for him today to introduce a bill that he didn't craft, that he didn't originate other than by name only. I know it is probably even more difficult that he is introducing a bill that was originally introduced by Republicans in the Senate.

It doesn't include even his priorities that I worked on long and hard with him, including the Elections Assistance Commission, which was a strong priority of his. They cut it by more than \$1 million over what we had included last year.

The Consumer Protection Safety Commission is also \$1 million below what our House bill was, and it does not fund the grants for pool safety, which I think we all know is a long-time House priority for many Members of this body.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act created an entirely new structure for the Treasury Department's Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. They need another \$6 million, just \$6 million to meet the requirements of this new authorization, which will help protect all of our Nation's interests.

I guess I should say it one more time. The Senate has let us down, and they don't even include that in this bill as well.

So I lay a lot of blame on the Senate bill itself and the components of the Senate bill, but that shouldn't take away from the fact that it is being introduced in this House today by the new majority.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the presentations that were given on opening day

last week as we were all sworn in, and I was hopeful that there would be a very open, deliberative debate process that we would engage in, in this House. I know there will be those that will claim there is urgency and there is haste, and we must move fast. But we should never move fast and hastily and disregard the constituencies that we each represent or their voices, or putting our fingerprints on legislation in the name of efficiency or in the name of where we are today and the political differences.

We must embrace this political debate. We must allow every Member's voice to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my friends on the other side of the aisle: Let's give this a chance. Let's open up this process. Let's come to the table.

We can do this. In fact, Mr. QUIGLEY and I have shown that that can be done even as we worked through last year.

We can fund border security. We can secure our Nation. We can reopen the government. We can incorporate the priorities of Republicans and Democrats in the House today, because, after all, we are closest to the people. Don't their voices deserve to be heard?

The American people are counting on us, Mr. Speaker, so they have elected us to do this. I hope we can do it. I rise in opposition and will be opposing this bill.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished, newly minted, first-ever chairwoman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to work with what we call our cardinal, the chair of this distinguished Subcommittee of Appropriations, and I thank him for yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump shutdown is now in its 19th day. It is simply outrageous that more than 800,000 Federal employees are going without pay and that the American people are being denied vital services, all because of President Trump's demands for a wasteful border wall.

House Democrats want to open the government, but the President and the Senate Republicans continue to obstruct and delay instead of working with us to get the people's business done.

□ 1430

The solution to this crisis is simple: Pass the bills where we can agree, and extend funding for Homeland Security for a month, 30 days, to allow time for negotiation on border security and immigration policy.

I hope that my colleagues across the Capitol come to their senses and stop this ridiculous, dangerous Trump shutdown. Unless Congress acts, the American people will continue to experience serious impacts from the shutdown.

Taxpayers rely on the IRS to assist them in making big choices for their fi-

nancial planning. That advice helps families make important decisions, like whether to put money into their savings or buy that new appliance to replace a broken one. With taxpayer assistance, phone lines, and centers closed for business, our constituents don't have anyone they can turn to.

Outside of the IRS, small businesses, which make up the backbone of our economy, also take a hit. With no access to Small Business Administration loans during the shutdown, those businesses will remain unable to make capital improvements, and entrepreneurs can't even attend workshops with the SBA to seek advice.

We can reopen both the IRS and the SBA today, along with other vital agencies like the FCC, the SEC, and the Federal judiciary. Democrats are again ready to act. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the State of Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, my good friend and wonderful Representative.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 264.

Unfortunately, as with all the appropriations bills we consider this week, moving this bill across the House floor will not resolve the partial government shutdown.

It is a job and responsibility of Congress to appropriate funds. We must come together, both Republicans and Democrats, in the House and the Senate, to put together a legislation solution that will reopen the government and fund border security, one that represents the will of both Chambers and the American people.

By considering only the Senate-passed versions of these appropriations bills, we are ignoring the will of this Chamber by eliminating House Members' involvement in the appropriations process.

The bill before us today funds Senate priorities at the expense of House priorities. In particular, the Financial Services and General Government bill falls short in several areas: constructing border points of entry, assisting taxpayers and U.S. businesses, and following through on commonsense bipartisan financial reforms.

I want to thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) for his efforts today and over the last several months to ensure that the House's voice is heard in this debate.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman-designate of the Appropriations Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2019 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill as an effective vehicle for reopening the

Federal Government agencies that are funded by this bill as expeditiously as possible.

The legislation before the House today is vitally important to ensuring the Federal Government and the U.S. economy can work for the American people. It safeguards our financial system, ensures a fair playing field for taxpayers, supports new businesses, cultivates the vibrancy and effectiveness of our telecommunications system, safeguards our workers, provides for the safety of our products, and protects the integrity of our elections.

Among the agencies funded under the bill are the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Election Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Small Business Administration.

With this current, unnecessary, misguided government shutdown, the agencies responsible for these objectives are not able to fulfill their mission for the American people.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers are being furloughed without pay; consumer help lines are going unanswered due to a lack of staff; enforcement activities are being suspended; and loans from the Small Business Administration are not being processed. In addition, with the closure of the Federal Election Commission, reports of political malfeasance are not being investigated.

And of great significance, without this funding, millions of Americans will not be able to have their tax returns processed so that they can receive the refunds on which they rely to make purchases and pay bills and school tuition. These refunds, when spent by taxpayers, contribute immensely to the national economy, creating and maintaining countless jobs.

As a member of the House Appropriations Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation, which passed the Senate last month on a bipartisan vote of 92-6.

Let's reopen these agencies and put the government back to work for the people, for the American people.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out really quickly that I hear the argument on the other side that passage of this bill will reopen the government right now, today, and get it all working again. Let me remind everyone, that will not happen. This is not the bill that fully funds what is outstanding at this point. This is one little component.

But I love the passion of my friend from Georgia. He and I worked well together on the committee, and he has taught me much. One thing he taught me was to fight for what is important, fight for those priorities that are important, and one of his number one priorities is omitted in this very bill that he is advocating for passage of.

Fight for your priorities, House Members. Republicans and Democrats alike, fight for what you believe in and don't let go, because the Senate passed something and it is easier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, a great champion for free markets and capitalism, and my good friend.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is plain and simple. It is a political stunt. And this is a sad offering 1 week into a new majority.

These bills are dead on arrival, as the ranking member, my friend TOM GRAVES, said, when they arrive in the Senate. The Senate majority leader has already said this. It is dead on arrival. Nor will it be signed into law by the President, who has already said he would veto it.

Furthermore, these bills have been stripped of House priorities that were in this bill reported out of TOM GRAVES' subcommittee last Congress. And they are not going to accomplish our number one goal, which is reopening the government and addressing the critical border security needs of our country.

House Republicans did our job last year by sending this and several other appropriations bills to the Senate that would have been signed into law and ultimately avoided a shutdown if our friends across the aisle had chosen substance over politics.

But this a greater point. What we should be focusing on, rather than this shell bill that is a political stunt, is what is not in this bill.

Now, there are a couple things that we passed last Congress in a bipartisan way that the incoming chair of the Financial Services Committee and I, as ranking member on the Financial Services Committee, both voted for.

We had the JOBS Act 3.0, which passed this House last Congress with 406 "yes" votes and 4 dissenting votes. Why is that not included in this bill? It should be included in this bill. It is a high priority.

Why don't we see more bills helping those who are underbanked in this country? Those who are living on the margins? Those who are on the edge? Why can't we get them included? Why can't we have financial inclusion as a part of this bill? It does not address them, nor does it help people who live in rural communities who don't have a single bank branch in their county.

So we have banking deserts in this country that separate people from access to basic financial services products. We need to fix that problem. The bill here before us doesn't address that issue either. Why aren't we doing more to help small businesses find the capital that they need?

Businesses are starved for additional risk capital so they can grow, create jobs, help their community, raise wages. But instead of talking about ways we can help people, this bill does

none of that. It is a political stunt. We should be focused on helping people and helping those who are on the margins through financial inclusion.

Let's get back to the priorities that the American people sent us here to take care of. Let's vote down this bill, and let's vote "yes" on something that can clear the Senate and get to the President's desk and be signed into law.

I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle in a constructive way in the coming months to do just that. But in the meantime, this is just a second-week charade, not essential to what we should be focused on here in the House of Representatives. We should be less focused on political optics and more about the reality of how we help everyday working Americans.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, but today I rise in support of H.R. 264, legislation that would reopen the Federal Government and put Wall Street's cop on the beat, the Securities and Exchange Commission, back to work.

This President has all but closed the door of the SEC, furloughing 94 percent of the agency and essentially providing fraudsters and schemers with a free pass to swindle investors and small businesses. With such a skeleton crew of less than 300 staff, the SEC cannot possibly oversee the activities of over 26,000 registered entities, such as investment advisers, broker dealers, and stock exchanges. Worse, the SEC is unable to hold bad actors accountable through most enforcement actions, preventing harmed investors from obtaining relief.

But the importance of the SEC goes beyond ensuring the rule of law. Businesses that are looking to enter the public stock markets may have to delay their initial public offerings because the SEC cannot approve their documents. Businesses seeking guidance from the SEC are left in legal limbo until the SEC can get back to work.

The Trump shutdown is jeopardizing the integrity of our financial markets and the hard-earned savings of millions of Americans. So let's end this Trump shutdown and open the government so that the SEC and other agencies can get back to work on behalf of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate some of the comments that have been made about the fact that we have been able to work together, both sides of the aisle on the Financial Services Committee, working on such things as the JOBS Act, but we can't do any of that. We cannot move. We cannot get to work for the American people because this President not only has shut down the government, but he took responsibility for

it. He wanted everybody to know that he did it—that he not only did it, but he is going to continue to do it until he can bend us to his will and give him \$5 billion-plus to put up a wall of some kind. We don't even know what it is.

So I want to say to my friends on the opposite side of the aisle and to Mr. MCHENRY, yes, we are going to be able to work together on a lot of good legislation, but why don't you join with us and talk to the President and tell him to open up government, that we cannot continue to have the American people suffer in the way that they are doing, and our financial services agencies are unable to do the job that the people sent them here to do.

□ 1445

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a few points.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has already been voted on. As I recall, last week, the majority party put this on the floor, passed it out of the House, and, guess what, the government is not open. This is not the solution. So I don't get why we are here today doing this in such a closed, lockdown process.

What is a solution, potentially, could be if the chairwoman's bipartisan efforts from last year were given the opportunity to be voted on today with a simple amendment. So what we are talking about, maybe, is that 15 or 20 more minutes of our precious time today is too much to ask to perfect Senate imperfections.

That is really what today's debate should be about. It is not about this legislation. We have already voted on it—we voted on it last week—and I think the minority voted “no,” the majority voted “yes,” and, guess what, the government is still not open. Why? There is only one reason and one reason only: Democrats are unwilling to negotiate with a President they just don't like.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to again add my congratulations to the incoming chairwoman of the House Financial Services Committee. I look forward to working with her and our committee in the 116th Congress.

But like my friend from Georgia and my friend from North Carolina, this bill is not a constructive effort today, Mr. Speaker. We voted on this bill last week. The McConnell Senate is not going to take it up. It is not going to produce our government reopening. It is not helping the government get reopened to put people back to work doing the people's work.

So this is really a waste of our time to be on the floor today. We should be putting that emphasis on a bipartisan effort to get Democratic leadership in the House and Senate working with the President on a solution to a comprehensive border security plan and reopen this government.

I want to also thank my friend for letting me talk about the insufficiency

of the Senate bill, as it does not contain our bipartisan provisions, 20 provisions this House approved, that we worked on on a bipartisan basis, that will improve access to capital across this country for small businesses, for our capital markets, and will lower the cost and make more transparent home buying.

Two things in particular I worked on with my friend, BILL FOSTER, from Illinois. The Volcker Rule Regulatory Harmonization Act, which we passed in this House, was not included in the Senate provision; and a provision to make insurance disclosures more transparent and more accurate for consumers for home mortgages, which was also passed, strongly bipartisan, by our committee and by this House was originally in our proposal, and it is not in the Senate bill, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, let's say to the American people, the bill we have on the floor today is not going to result in the government reopening; it is not going to be voted on in the Senate; it is not going to be approved by President Trump; and it is deficient. It does not include the bipartisan priorities in financial services ably included in the House version by Mr. GRAVES.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GRAVES for his leadership.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chairwoman of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are now 18 days into the Trump shutdown, and America's small businesses are feeling the strain. Each day that this political stunt continues, entrepreneurs lose out on nearly \$90 million in affordable capital through the Small Business Administration's 7(a) lending program alone. That is 192 small firms per day going without the resources they need to grow and create new jobs.

As chairwoman of the Small Business Committee, I am deeply concerned that President Trump is holding America's small business sector hostage as he demands funding for a cruel and ineffective border wall. Contrary to the President's remarks, this shutdown isn't just hurting workers who collect a paycheck in blue States; its impacts are being felt on Main Street across this country.

For 3 weeks now, the SBA—the only Federal agency dedicated to our Nation's entrepreneurs—has ceased its core operations. Make no mistake about it: This puts hundreds of millions of dollars out of reach for millions of small businesses who seek to utilize these services. For small firms operating in the Federal marketplace, the shutdown could cause them to sacrifice nearly 7,000 contracts worth over \$300 million each day.

Unfortunately, the consequences don't end there. For countless small businesses—from those surrounding

our national parks to small grocers who accept SNAP—a lack of customers is leading to lost revenues, and the bills are adding up.

Let us also not forget what happened to our economy after Republicans shut down the government in 2013: small business hiring and consumer confidence fell; the IRS was unable to provide taxpayer assistance; and our economy lost billions because of disrupted government spending.

But what this shutdown really comes down to is a President who, time and again, has sought to divide us by labeling immigrants as the enemy. I am here to tell you that welcoming immigrants is not just a founding principle of this Nation, it is good economic policy.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Immigrants are among America's most successful entrepreneurs, starting about a quarter of all new businesses. And Dreamers, whose future our President continues to jeopardize, start businesses at rates higher than the overall public. Instead of talking about building walls, let's put America's entrepreneurial sector back to work.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, largely, in this debate, you are hearing two different elements. You are hearing a little bit of a policy argument on the Democratic side, the other side of the aisle, and from our side you are hearing a process argument. I think this is really important.

We, in essence, are in the third day of the 116th Congress and shutting the process down, 435 Members' voices being silenced. Extrapolate that across 800,000 constituents we each represent. Those are the voices that are being silenced here today in the name of expediency, in the name of political stunts, in the name of finger-pointing, but without really any resolve or desire to bring a fruitful, positive conclusion to what is a very difficult and painful time that we are in right now. I agree with that.

I think about over the holidays, and it is interesting how the other side is pointing fingers at the President here and there, but the President was here. He was in Washington, D.C. He was waiting for the other side to come and have a discussion and talk about these tough issues together, to work through them. Where were they? If I recall, maybe the incoming Speaker-elect might have been in Hawaii. Other Members were on vacations with their families.

While families of these agencies were struggling and wondering about their next day, their Christmas, and their next paycheck, the leadership of the Democratic Party was on vacation while the President was here saying: I am here. The door is open. Let's talk.

I think he still extends that invitation, and I hope they take us up on that.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, for 19 days, critical financial agencies which serve the people have been closed. Taxpayer assistance has stopped; the people's refunds are at risk of serious delay; small business support is suspended; and consumer protection work has been halted. People are hurting. It is a self-inflicted wound.

But today, we have the opportunity to reopen these critical agencies for the people. The solution is simple: vote "yes" on this legislation; put people above politics; and reopen our government today.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Garcia), my distinguished colleague, and the cradle of leadership on the Cook County board.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. QUIGLEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump shutdown is harmful and irresponsible.

On the first day of this new Congress, House Democrats sent legislation to open up the government. I supported it, and I will continue to support this legislation to open up parts of the government immediately.

Each day the Republican shutdown continues, hardworking Americans and families suffer. Right now, the IRS is operating with only 12 percent of its workforce, threatening the agency's ability to process and disburse tax refunds in a timely manner.

That is why today I am sending a letter to President Trump with the support of my colleague, Representative LLOYD DOGGETT of Texas, and over 50 Members of Congress, urging him to end the shutdown and warning him of the effects that that shutdown is having on families.

Just yesterday, The Washington Post noted that students reliant on Federal financial aid for college are facing trouble providing the Department of Education verification of their income because of furloughs at the IRS. I represent many immigrant and working-class families who rely on their annual tax refund to feed their families, pay for their children's education, and buy their gas to get to work.

Mr. Speaker, families are suffering, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and reopen the government.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if you think about the overarching discussion and issue and

where the division is, it is really about the fundamental question of border security.

Some don't like the term, "the wall." I would hope, maybe, that we are all for securing our country. Maybe it is just terminology that separates us oftentimes, but through this time of thinking about the words we are choosing, lives are being altered; they are being impacted.

Individuals are losing their lives because of illegal activity that occurs through our porous border, and it is just, in many cases, because of insufficient funds while we have this debate about words and terminology: What is a fence? or a wall? or a barrier? or technology? It doesn't really matter what terms we use when lives are being altered daily while we squabble, just squabble, over a few terms.

It is amazing how the other side says that they can't support this, they just can't support funding for the wall. What they are saying, really, is that they can't support this President because they don't like him.

But, in fact, on two different occasions, within the last 18 or 19 months, the new majority party did vote for wall funding. They voted for border security. It was \$1.6 billion on two separate occasions. Both times have been signed into law by this same President.

I wonder: Why is it too much to ask to just put in a different number, a little bit more? Is our country not worth just a little bit more? Is a life not worth just a little bit more when national experts say it is necessary? Or are political differences going to stand in the way of that?

I hope today we can break through that.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1500

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. QUIGLEY for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 264. This bill appropriates desperately needed funds for the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service.

As the shutdown persists, the financial and emotional drain on employees and taxpayers continues. There are tens of thousands of furloughed Treasury employees who want to work and proudly would do so, but they cannot. They also cannot pay bills, cannot afford medical care, and, like us, cannot understand any of this. Every day that passes and every minute the shutdown continues it is too long and too costly. Reopen the government and begin to negotiate.

I spoke to the Treasury Secretary yesterday, along with the IRS Commissioner as well, regarding the impact of the partial shutdown on the IRS and

the tax-filing season. I was informed that the IRS will release its contingency plan for the tax-filing season in the next few hours, or, certainly, within the next day and issuing refunds in coming days, apparently, an effort will be made to reach that goal, but it will also require a significant number of IRS employees to return to work without pay.

These developments are no substitute for fully funding the government and reopening the agency. Reminder: The average refund is just under \$3,000. That helps out a lot of middle-class individuals who will use it to pay down Christmas debt, perhaps. They depend upon that as part of regular cash flow.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know the full damage and cost of the shutdown, but we knew going into it that somebody was going to get hurt. So we should end it today before any more damage is done.

If a taxpayer calls the IRS right now for assistance, they will hear the following: "Live telephone assistance is not available at this time. Normal operations will resume as soon as possible." But they are expected to go into work as well to help process those tax forms.

The time is now to reopen the government, and as I noted, negotiate.

The time has come for our colleagues on both sides to stand up and vote "yes" and fully reopen these agencies.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are reaching a conclusion on this, because we just went through this last week, might I remind you. Same stuff, same legislation, voted on, passed out of the House and guess what? The government is still not open and operating. So are we really trying to get to a workable solution here by the new majority or just drive another wedge in our country?

This passage today, if it were to occur, will not change anything. It will only drive us a little further apart and will not reopen the government. Let's not kid anyone. Let's make sure those sound bites don't get out there and that the headlines aren't that, because that is truly not what is going to happen at all.

What is happening today is an example of abdicating our responsibilities as duly elected Members of the House of Representatives in the name of expediency and political tactics. That is what is happening here today. It is really what that vote is today.

A "yes" vote is an affirmation that I am for the expediency of doing away with responsibilities because it is easy and it is politically advantageous. A "no" vote is saying I am going to stand up for the voices of this House. I am going to stand up for the constituencies that we represent. I am going to stand up for the priorities of this House and wait and fight for a better process.

This process is amazing. Actually, it is reckless, to be honest with you, Mr. Speaker. I mean, are we going to be a bicameral system anymore? Is this an

example of what we should see and is this a forecast of the days ahead that there will be no debate in a committee?

A bill is introduced—and you watched the cartoons growing up and it seemed like it was a simple process: a person has a nice idea; they write it down on a piece of paper and they turn it in; and people look at it and perfect it a little bit; and all of a sudden, you build support for something across the aisle and across the different coalitions; and then you get to share it and advocate for it; and then it goes to the other body.

Then they get a choice. Do they want to make changes to it, and such, and input it through a committee. That is not how it is happening today. This is the new majority, a very closed, very dark process in which not even Democrat Members—if I were one of the 60 new Members elected on the other side, I would be throwing my hands up in the air right now saying, wait a minute. I did all that work for this, for you to tell me what I must vote on? And I have a binary choice, yes or no? That is the only choice I get?

Mr. Speaker, I feel for the new incoming Members. This is not what it was supposed to be like for them. I don't think it is what you recruited them for, as well. It is a sacrifice, really. It is sacrificing all of our priorities that we have as a House, all for a process because there are folks who just don't like this President.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in that position before too. In fact, I remember Barack Obama when he was President. I disagreed with him as a President. I didn't want him to fail though because it meant our country was failing. I disagreed with him on policy, and I would share that, and advocate, but I would try to influence as well.

I don't see any ability here or ideas of influencing outcomes, but I will close with this, Mr. Speaker, because I want to share with you some words that have been heard around this town and on the Hill in recent days and months. These are quotes.

"Members today seem to have a better chance today of getting struck by lightning than getting their amendments made in order. They come here with real ideas and germane amendments, only to be told 'no,' again, and again, and again."

Next quote: "We shouldn't be stifling debate."

Next quote: "I do think we will find a lot of agreement on some pretty commonsense ideas, but we need a more accommodating process, though. We need to follow regular order and the House needs to actually debate again." That was in September.

Also in September: "I feel like we are living in an authoritarian regime," heard on the Hill here.

"It is like this majority is allergic to an open process."

And then, lastly: "With each new closed rule they bring to the floor, shutting out amendments from both

Democrats and Republicans, the cynical hypocrisy grows louder and louder. Instead of the people's House, this has, sadly, become only the people who agree," at that time, "with PAUL RYAN's House."

Might I share the author of these quotes? It would be the chairman of the Rules Committee today, Chairman MCGOVERN. Those are his words, and he is absolutely right, but he was forecasting today in this moment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad time in the House of Representatives. Very sad. I agree with Mr. MCGOVERN. He is absolutely right, and it is at this moment today in which it has been proven to be true.

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

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

It is interesting to hear a discourse on functioning government as we look back at 2018 when my colleagues across the aisle operated under 103 closed rules. Circumstances today are of an exigent manner. The government is not functioning. Lives are at risk. The time for leadership, the time to not stymie ideas, and the time for functioning government is apparently gone. So we must act and we must act quickly.

If we are talking history, let's go a little further back. In the history of the United States, when one party was in control of the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, there has never been a shutdown until this administration.

So today, when all of those opportunities are passed, we now hear that it is somehow a shame that government isn't allowed to function. The government isn't functioning. It has to be open. Then we can begin operating under open bills and in a manner in which everyone would like to see on a bipartisan basis.

But right now, there is real danger out there for the American public. So we are now into the 19th day under this President's shutdown, the second longest shutdown in the Nation's history and already the third one under this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to govern. We are here not to play games. Let's do our job for the American people. Let's support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman QUIGLEY for his leadership in putting this bill together so that federal workers can get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the FY 2019 Financial Services Appropriations Bill, which provides more than \$23 billion to partially re-open the government.

This important bill would reopen the Internal Revenue Service (IRS)—ensuring hardworking families receive their tax returns on time. It would also help to restart the taxpayer assistance centers, which serve approximately 2.5 million citizens monthly.

This shutdown is affecting real lives, Mr. Speaker. Real people.

According to the Washington Post, IRS furloughed employee Krystle Kirkpatrick, said she and her family of four can scrape along on her partner's machinist salary for a while, but she's already thinking about signing up to be a plasma donor to earn extra cash. That's only an extra \$200.

Let me reiterate. A federal employee is considering becoming a plasma donor—because her paycheck, from her federal government job, won't be coming in the mail.

This is no way to run a country.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump shutdown is hurting real families and it's hurting our economy. Let's pass this bill. Let's get the government back open and get workers their paychecks.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Financial Services Bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 28, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Graves of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 264 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 71, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 74, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$2,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this motion seeks to address one of the many important shortfalls in the Senate bill, and I know there are many, and we can only address one or two, or an exception here in this moment of a motion to recommit.

I wish the Rules Committee would have allowed for—we have had this debate already today—allowed for Members of both parties to offer their ideas to insert better concepts and to make perfection out of something that is certainly not a perfect product coming from the Senate.

I think the American people, through their elected Representatives of this body, deserve that opportunity as well to amend and improve this legislation, but the new Democratic majority has certainly shut down this legislative process.

I just read quotes from the current chairman of the Rules Committee and his disgust with that very same concept or process from months ago, and,

yet, it is being imposed upon us today. This is our only opportunity to improve the bill, and as meager as this might be, this is important.

This motion is really simple. It just adds \$2 million to the Treasury Department's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which would match the House past levels that we passed last year of \$161 million.

This important office is fighting on the front lines to enforce economic sanctions against rogue nations like Iran, North Korea, and Russia. Mr. Speaker, you and I agree on how important that is, and they must have the resources necessary.

The Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act which created this office, passed this House in 2017 by a vote of 419 yeases to just 3 noes. So it was very bipartisan. That is about as good as it gets around here. And it passed the Senate 98–2—another great mark as well—and President Trump signed it into law. It is an amazing needle to thread all through there that we had great bipartisan support here in the House, the Senate, and the President signing this into law.

This is overwhelmingly bipartisan, Mr. Speaker, and it brings the full force of our Nation's sanctions against countries that seek to do us harm. This is something we should support.

It is so important that OMB Director Mick Mulvaney sent us a budget amendment requesting more funds to stand up this office. And that is not a request we often get from Mr. Mulvaney to increase spending anywhere. But, yet, he did that.

And you know the former Director himself, as he served here, he doesn't like to spend a penny more than needed, so this is certainly a very important priority.

The Treasury has also made a strong case that to comply with the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, the Department needs these funds. So as we debate about the importance of the moment and where we are in time, I could see nothing more important for us to focus on than to put an additional \$2 million into this program and offset it, as has been described in the amendment from the GSA's rental payments.

I hope every Member can support this commonsense improvement. We are just improving on the Senate bill. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, responsibly funding the Federal Government is one of the most important duties of Congress. The previous majority failed to do the most basic task of keeping the lights on.

□ 1515

On day 19 of the 116th Congress, we Democrats are here to reopen Federal

agencies shuttered by the President's shutdown.

This legislation, which has already garnered strong bipartisan support in the Senate, will ensure that the Federal Government is open and working for the American people.

Now, as to perfection, it is not perfect. I have not been here for a perfect piece of legislation. What is critical to take from that argument, though, is the fact that any one of us can argue that there isn't some measure absolutely critical to them and they are not going to vote for it because of that.

Respectfully, someone has to be the adult in the room and get things done. Someone has to respect the process, the importance of what the government does, and the needs of the American people. You can't kick the ball in the forest preserve and go home. You have to move forward.

This is the way to operate, the manner in which the Senate has already done, a manner in which we can accomplish and move forward together to try to get this better, hopefully, next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit because I think it is important we remember President Trump has always wanted a shutdown. He boasted a year and a half ago that what the government needs is a good government shutdown. There is no such thing, as we now know.

On December 11—not ancient history—he sat in the Oval Office, getting red in the face, shouting: "I will be the one to shut it down."

He then followed through on that promise by torpedoing a government funding agreement that passed the Senate with unanimous support.

Once again, Federal employees and Federal contracts were being held hostage by this President, all because of a broken campaign promise. He said Mexico was going to pay for his wall. Now he needs a bailout from the American taxpayer. Fortunately, the new Democratic majority in this House is going to stand up to this President and has offered a sensible plan to fund the government.

The bill that passed in the Senate is part of a four-bill package and, by a vote of 92–6, provides a 1.9 percent badly needed pay increase for all Federal employees and guarantees backpay to the Federal employees furloughed during this unnecessary Trump shutdown.

I support the underlying bill because we can and should end this Trump shutdown now.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply encourage my colleagues to vote "no," and 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ADOPTING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 5, proceedings will now resume on the resolution (H. Res. 6) adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Friday, January 4, 2019, the portion of the divided question comprising title II had been disposed of.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 5, the portion of the divided question comprising title III is now debatable for 1 hour.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the ability of the Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives, to intervene and defend the Affordable Care Act in the case of Texas v. United States.

This case is a backhanded way to do what Republicans could not do legislatively: repeal the ACA and take away comprehensive health insurance from millions of Americans.

Madam Speaker, I represent a district that has the highest number of people—more than 100,000—enrolled in the ACA. Whether you get your health insurance from your employer, from Medicare, from Medicaid, or from the marketplace, you have something to lose if this disastrous court case is upheld.

Not only will insurance companies again be able to deny coverage to people with preexisting conditions, young people will no longer be able to stay on their parents' insurance until they are 26. Preventive services like flu shots and annual checkups will not necessarily be covered without cost. Women may, once again, face buying insurance that doesn't cover maternity care.

Our bipartisan efforts to phase out the Medicare doughnut hole could

come to an end. Our seniors should not have to choose between paying exorbitant costs for prescription drugs and buying food or paying rent.

An overwhelming majority of Americans support all of these provisions.

Madam Speaker, with this rule, we simply want to stand in court and defend the valuable protections in the Affordable Care Act that this case threatens to take away.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by welcoming my good friend from Florida, first, to the Rules Committee, congratulate her on her first rule on the floor, and, finally, thank her quite sincerely for the distinguished service she rendered to our country when she was a member of the Cabinet for former President Clinton. It is wonderful to have the gentlewoman in the people's House.

Madam Speaker, we are here again, this time on the third and final title of the rules package for the 116th Congress. Title III authorizes the House to intervene, otherwise appear, or take any other steps in the case *Texas v. United States*, the lawsuit currently pending over the legality of the Affordable Care Act. In essence, if this passes, the House will be giving Speaker PELOSI the authority to intervene in this lawsuit on behalf of the entire House of Representatives.

I spoke briefly about this matter during the debate of the overall rules package last week, and I am sure my opposition to title III comes as no surprise to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Today, we have several speakers on our side from the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, all of whom are deeply familiar with these issues and who will be able to tackle this in more detail. But for now, I will make a few key points.

First and foremost, it really isn't a surprise that the Democrats' poorly written healthcare law finds itself, once again, in legal trouble. The lawsuit this time arises from Texas where 20 States have filed suits on the grounds that, because there is no longer a tax penalty in place for failing to purchase health insurance under the individual mandate, and because there is no severability clause, the law itself is unconstitutional.

Last month, a district court judge in Texas agreed with the States and struck down the Affordable Care Act. That ruling has been stayed pending appeal.

This really should not have come as a surprise to the majority. At the time the Affordable Care Act was passed, many of us on the Republican side raised similar concerns. The act, as drafted, was too poorly written and too precariously balanced to stand up under its own weight.

The succeeding 9 years have caused those predictions to come to pass. Pre-

miums have skyrocketed; insurers have fled the market; and for many Americans, the care they thought they were accessing under the Affordable Care Act has become anything but affordable.

Before Republicans acted last Congress to repeal the tax penalty for the individual mandate, literally millions of taxpayers made the decision to pay that penalty instead of buying health insurance they could not afford.

No matter what the outcome of this lawsuit will be, House Republicans have over and over again expressed their support for protections for those with preexisting conditions. Should the Texas decision be upheld, Republicans stand ready to work with Democrats to build an insurance system that protects people with preexisting conditions, increases transparency and choice, and lowers costs across the country.

That is exactly what we tried to do in the last Congress with the American Health Care Act, which we in the House proposed and passed as a solution to the broken law that is the Affordable Care Act. While it fell short in the Senate, its passage in the House clearly shows Republicans were ready to take steps to fix this broken system.

Rather than taking those steps today, Democrats are asking us to grant Speaker PELOSI a blank check to intervene in this lawsuit. Rather than allowing the States to continue to pursue this litigation, as is their right under the Constitution, Democrats want this House to intervene. But the majority has not said why intervention is necessary and why the House of Representatives must jump into this litigation against some of the States. Other States have already made the decision to intervene in support of the Affordable Care Act, rendering intervention by this House unnecessary.

At best, this proposal is a political exercise intended to allow the majority to reiterate their position on the Affordable Care Act. At worst, it is an attempt to pressure the courts. Either way, there is no real justification for doing what the majority wishes to do today.

Madam Speaker, the best way for the majority to protect Americans and to protect access to healthcare is to pass a constitutionally sound law that is well considered, well structured, and that will result in lower premiums and better access to health insurance. It is not what they have proposed here, which is a wasteful expenditure of taxpayer dollars to defend the indefensible.

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his kind words at the beginning of his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is the distin-

guished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Shalala) for yielding me the time.

It is an honor to serve with her on the House Rules Committee. As the longest serving HHS Secretary in U.S. history, she spent much of her life leading on the issue of healthcare.

Madam Speaker, the American people have been living in fear for years, worried that Washington Republicans would make good on their promise to repeal the Affordable Care Act and that the President and his allies in Congress would take away their ability to see a doctor or afford care, including for preexisting conditions from asthma to domestic abuse.

Who can blame them?

When the minority controlled this institution, they voted 69 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act. Sixty-nine times they tried to take away healthcare from more than 23 million Americans. Thankfully, the Senate thwarted these efforts, and Republicans weren't successful.

Now the Trump administration is using the legal system to try to do what the Republican Congress could not: strike down the Affordable Care Act. Its Justice Department has asked in a legal filing for the courts to invalidate this law and, in doing so, erase protections for preexisting conditions.

Now, I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle try to pretend that they are somehow champions of this provision, despite working relentlessly to abolish it and voting nearly 70 times to undermine the ACA.

Madam Speaker, who are they kidding?

This Democratic majority doesn't deal in alternative facts. The American people are smarter than that.

Thankfully, it is a new Congress, and this majority isn't trying to abolish preexisting condition coverage. Instead, we are moving swiftly to protect it on the opening days of this Congress.

□ 1530

This measure will allow this House to legally intervene to protect preexisting condition coverage in the Affordable Care Act. If you support coverage for preexisting conditions, then you will support this measure to try and protect it. It is that simple.

Enough with the sound bites. It is time to vote. I urge all my colleagues to vote for this measure.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of both the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, who also happens to be perhaps the foremost expert on the ACA in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let's get one thing clear from the start: the majority should not be acting like they are doing something that

hasn't already been done. It is not something new. Nothing we do on title III of the rules package will change what the House has already voted on and how the court will receive it.

Title III of H. Res. 6 would authorize the Speaker of the House of Representatives to intervene or take any other legal actions in cases involving the Affordable Care Act, but in particular, the Texas v. United States case, where a court recently ruled that the Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional due to the elimination of the individual mandate.

If this all sounds familiar to you, it should. Last week, at the start of the 116th Congress, the House voted on title I of the rules package that included the same provisions giving the Speaker the same authority to intervene in the same case.

Actually, the Speaker has already filed three motions to intervene in the Texas case the same day the rule was passed last week. The fact is, nothing has changed between last week and today, and the Speaker does not need to be given this authority again.

But what are the facts?

The facts are that this bill, the Affordable Care Act, was sold to the American people on a misrepresentation. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. You may remember that. If you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance. Your premium is going to be down by \$2,500. And, of course, famously: We've got to pass the bill to find out what is in it.

As a practical matter, people are forced to buy insurance that they may not want; that they certainly cannot afford; and, in fact, that they are afraid to use because the deductible and the copay is so high.

So, again, I am not sure how the House is intervening in the judicial process to support a failing policy while millions of Americans are functionally uninsured. I don't understand how that helps us to deliver better access to care in north Texas and across the country.

Americans should see this for what it is: a facade of the Democrats who want to revive the individual mandate under the guise of protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. I think the House can be more effective in delivering on the promises of the American people. That should be the goal of this House. It is not the goal of the House today, unfortunately.

I urge my fellow Members to vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her distinguished service as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and I thank her for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Legal scholars

from across the ideological spectrum agree that this latest challenge to the Affordable Care Act is legally frivolous. However, because of the devastating impact that it will have on Americans, it is critical that we use our authority to intervene on their behalf.

If Republicans successfully dismantle the Affordable Care Act, the consequences will be felt by all Americans, including the millions of people with employer-sponsored coverage. They will lose protections for patients with preexisting conditions; they will lose prohibitions on annual and lifetime coverage limits; they will lose access to low- or no-cost preventive care; and they will lose the popular provision which allows young people to stay on their parents' insurance policies up to the age of 26.

These protections are all a product of the Affordable Care Act, and they are all at risk. We can't take the chance on this lawsuit being successful and then wait for a replacement, because we already know what the replacement will be. The House-passed replacement for the Affordable Care Act from a few years ago would have resulted in millions of fewer people with insurance and according to CBO, the costs would go up 20 percent the first year, insurance would cover less than it covers now; and those with preexisting conditions would lose their protections. That is what would happen if this lawsuit is successful.

This vote is about fulfilling our responsibility to act in the best interests of the American people. I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), my good friend, who is also the former chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and current ranking member.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to title III of the Democrats' rules package which, as you have heard, paves the way for Speaker PELOSI to unilaterally take legal action on behalf of the entire House of Representatives in the ongoing court case surrounding the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act and any future court cases on the ACA as she sees fit. That is a pretty big blank check.

Madam Speaker, first of all, I object to this vote on the grounds of pure common sense. The authority we are voting on today was already given to the Speaker last week under title I of the Democrats' rules package. You can look it up. It is right there, beginning on page 30. You will find it after the provisions that make it easier for House Democrats to increase taxes and to set up automatic debt limit increases. Not to mention, Speaker PELOSI has already filed three motions to the court to intervene in the case since last week's vote.

Moreover, Democratic Attorneys General from intervening States are al-

ready defending the law in the case, and the judge's ruling has already been stayed and appealed. So this is an unnecessary waste of time, paper, and ink.

I can only assume part of the reason for today's show vote is to distract from Democrats' real radical views on healthcare.

Madam Speaker, where is the single-payer, \$32 trillion government takeover of healthcare bill which ends employer- and union-sponsored healthcare and forces the 158 million Americans who get their healthcare through their job into a one-size-fits-all government-run plan?

A majority of House Democrats supported that proposal—or one very like it—in the last Congress. When will they keep their promise to bring that plan up for a vote?

Madam Speaker, today's vote to repeat the authorities given the Speaker last week is just for show. It is not a serious exercise in legislating. Meanwhile, last week, Republicans brought a powerful but simple amendment to the floor that would have actually called on this body to legislate on something we all could agree needs to be done, and that is to lock in protections for patients with preexisting conditions. But, unfortunately, in a fit of partisanship, Democrats voted that down.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary political theater today and vote "no" so we can work together expeditiously to guarantee preexisting condition protections for all Americans, and do so in a manner that can withstand judicial scrutiny.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, Trump and his apologists are so very good at breaking things. It is just fixing them they can't seem to find an answer to.

This underlying lawsuit is little more than a conspiracy between a criminally-indicted Texas Republican attorney general and the Trump administration that couldn't find its voice when it was time to defend protections for preexisting conditions for so many American families.

There is no doubt there is collusion. There is Republican collusion right here. It is collusion to strip away lifesaving protection from so many Americans.

Intervening in this lawsuit is an important step in protecting families from the uncertainties of fine-print denials, excessive premiums, inadequate coverage, and just basic access to affordable healthcare.

We must intervene because of a preexisting condition—and it is a rather unusual one. It is called amnesia. These Republicans have political amnesia. They cannot remember before the Affordable Care Act how many families got a diagnosis of bankruptcy at the same time they got a diagnosis

of a severe disease or experienced an accident.

They had over 60 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but they never could come up with a plan to present to this House to replace the Affordable Care Act because, for all of its shortcomings, it is the best answer right now to the needs of the American people.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my good friend, the former chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and now its current ranking member.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to title III of the Democratic rules package, which will allow House Democrats to file a motion in Texas v. United States defending the constitutionality of the ACA.

This lawsuit, which was filed by more than 20 State Attorneys General, is about individual liberty and whether the Federal Government can force individuals to purchase a product.

When the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the ACA 6 years ago, it did so under the logic that the individual mandate was a tax. I disagreed with that rule then, but because we now have repealed the tax, the Supreme Court's rationale for upholding the law was applied by the district court when it found the mandate inseparable from the law and struck it down.

The promise of the ACA, which we can all agree on, was to increase access to, and lower the cost of, healthcare. In my State of Tennessee alone, the average premium prices have gone up 176 percent in 8 years, with deductible levels that are nothing more than the equivalent to catastrophic coverage.

Let me give you an example, Madam Speaker. The majority of the uncollectible debt in the hospital where I work are people with insurance, not without insurance. Giving people access to a card does not necessarily equal coverage. That is why, in my district alone, you had nearly the same number of people who paid the tax that actually got the benefit.

In the ruling in Texas v. U.S. the courts are giving Congress an opportunity for a much-needed do-over. I spent over 30 years of my life taking care of patients, and in that time I never saw a Republican or Democratic disease. Preexisting conditions can affect anyone. All of us in the House want to ensure those affected by serious illnesses can access affordable care.

Rather than keeping the cost burden on the middle class, let's work together to protect those with preexisting conditions while also trusting Americans to make their own decisions when buying coverage that best fits the needs of their family.

How can we find common ground?

Well, if you have ever received your health insurance from an employer in the private sector, you were covered by

ERISA and its updates under HIPAA, which protect people with preexisting conditions from being denied coverage. Unfortunately, the rules weren't the same for the individual and small-group markets, and that is where the problem arose.

A simple solution to this problem is to apply those large-group ERISA protections to individual and small-group markets and the preexisting coverage question is solved.

Whether you are for or against the passage of the ACA, it should be clear that the law is broken. Instead of continuing to support a law that clearly isn't working, why don't we come together and enact a real patient-centered, free-market healthcare system that treats individuals and small groups like big corporations.

The bottom line is that the ACA has failed, at least in my State. The House of Representatives has more important work to focus on than getting involved in litigation to resuscitate a law that is broken and is causing problems for many individuals and families across America.

If we defeat title III of the Democratic rules package, I am hopeful this will be the first step in agreeing that we should be focusing on bipartisan reforms to our healthcare system, instead of wasting our time on litigation. I urge opposition to the rule.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rules package before us. This package includes, among other things, a critical provision defending the affordable healthcare of Americans.

I came to Congress with a resounding message from my constituents to protect and expand affordable, quality healthcare. Parents should not have to choose between paying rent or healthcare for their children. Students should not have to choose between paying for school or health insurance. Children should not have to spend sleepless nights worried about paying for aging parents' healthcare.

□ 1545

It is unacceptable that American families are one healthcare emergency away from financial ruin.

This administration is once again undermining the Affordable Care Act and ignoring a clear message from the American people. Quality healthcare is a right and should not be the privilege of the few who can afford it.

I will continue using my voice in Congress to advocate for those who need us most, pushing this body to protect the healthcare of my constituents.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my good friend, who not only provided lifesaving care to men and women in uniform in another

career, but has actually done that in this body as well.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I will admit I am a little bit confused here today because the part of the rule package that we are debating was already passed by the Democratic majority last week. So why are we here again?

I hear some people say: "I stand in strong support of this." Well, good. You did last week, too.

I suspect some see it as trying to falsely claim that Republicans are opposed to protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. I guarantee you, as a doctor, there is no part of me that doesn't want people in America to have insurance and coverage for their conditions. There is no part of me. In fact, it is just the opposite.

Just last week, in one of our first votes this year, every Republican in this Chamber voted for the House to take action this month that—word for word, our Republican amendment said—"guarantees no American citizen can be denied health insurance coverage as the result of a previous illness or health status" and "guarantees no American citizen can be charged higher premiums or cost sharing as the result of a previous illness or health status."

Curiously, not one of my Democratic colleagues voted for this.

This is only the most recent action of many we have taken to support and protect Americans with preexisting health conditions in the last few years.

Rather, this rule package allows Speaker PELOSI to use the U.S. House as a shield to try and defend the individual mandate, the same mandate that this very Chamber has already zeroed out.

The individual mandate, in its original form, forced Americans to buy something simply because they are alive, or they will be penalized. This said that Congress has the authority to penalize Americans for not buying something, penalize you just because you are alive. How is that for freedom?

By the way, there is a difference between dismantling a flawed bill, the flawed Affordable Care Act, and mending its every flaw, which we have tried to do and, in some cases, we have done.

But going back to the rule, this takes away each Member's right to vote on how we want the House to engage in litigation. Rather, it gives more power to one person and takes power away from this body as a whole to have a say in the matter.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this title of the rules package. It is bad policy, bad posturing.

And since this vote is a repeat, I repeat: Republicans are and have been and have supported and have voted for coverage for Americans with preexisting conditions, period.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution authorizing the House to defend the Affordable Care Act in court against baseless but potentially devastating litigation designed to dismantle the law.

Because of the ACA, which passed without a single Republican vote, millions of Americans now have access to health insurance, including those with preexisting conditions. Yet ever since it became law, the ACA has been the target of nonstop attacks by Republican politicians intent on stripping Americans of the important protections guaranteed by the law.

For the last 8 years, when the Republicans controlled the House, they voted 62 times to repeal the ACA but never once came up with a proposal to protect Americans with preexisting conditions.

Despite all the Republicans' efforts, the ACA still stands today, continuing to guarantee access to affordable, quality health insurance. But now, 21 Republican State attorneys general have launched a new attack on the law, based on tortured logic and flimsy legal reasoning.

The Department of Justice has a duty to defend every duly enacted law, absent exceptional circumstances. The Trump administration, however, has broken this well-established norm and now refuses to defend the law from this latest challenge, a decision that caused several career Justice Department attorneys to resign in protest.

The Judiciary Committee will be investigating how the Trump administration made this blatantly political decision to abdicate its responsibility, and the committee will be holding those responsible accountable for their actions.

While the administration turns its back on people with preexisting conditions and people who would go bankrupt without the law's cost-sharing subsidies, with this resolution, the House of Representatives has an opportunity to provide the defense that the ACA and the millions of Americans who depend on it every day deserve.

Although legal scholars across the ideological spectrum find the plaintiffs' arguments laughable, it has found a sympathetic judge in Texas who recently ruled the entire law must be overturned.

This resolution would authorize the House to intervene in the case as it works its way through the courts on appeal to ensure that the law's vital protections are properly defended in court.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to allow the House to fend off this latest Republican assault against the health and well-being of Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my good friend.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rules package authorizing the House to intervene in the lawsuit against ObamaCare, *Texas v. United States*. The American people sent us here to do a job: to solve problems, to improve their lives, and to move this country forward. However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be more interested in playing partisan games than problem-solving.

Why do I say this? Because Democrats have already voted to pass this exact provision last week. They have even filed three motions to intervene in the ObamaCare lawsuit.

On the substance of the matter at hand, ObamaCare is one of the worst, most destructive pieces of legislation to have ever passed this House, and the facts on that are indisputable. Just ask some of my hardworking, God-fearing farmers and ranchers and small businesses in west Texas.

ObamaCare has ruined our healthcare system; it is crushing our economy; and it is breaking the backs of our small businesses and our working families.

Madam Speaker, we shouldn't spend another day nor should we spend another dime on attempting to prop up this top-down, government-controlled healthcare system that is collapsing under its own weight. It is unconscionable to me and the American people to continue to throw good money after bad policy like this.

Instead of doubling down on ObamaCare and its flawed framework of mandates, taxes, and regulations that drove healthcare costs to the Moon, we should be working on policies together that truly reduce costs and continue to provide access to the greatest quality of care in the world here in the United States.

No government plan, no government program can divine these desired outcomes. Only a healthy market with robust competition and maximum consumer choice can achieve them.

Now, my colleagues on the other side talk a lot about protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. I agree. My colleagues on the Republican side agree. That is why we passed our Healthcare Reform Act with protections for folks with preexisting conditions. That is why, last week, Republicans voted to ensure Americans with preexisting conditions are protected.

This is a game. We have already done it. We have already voted. We stand firm to protect people with preexisting conditions.

But today's vote isn't about protecting people with preexisting conditions. It is about Democrat-produced political theater. That is what it is. It is about trying to save what is left of ObamaCare, and it is actually in preparation for a single-payer system, for socialized medicine, and for complete government control of our healthcare economy.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve real solutions to affordable

care. They deserve real solutions: markets that are free to create any number of products and services.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I repeat: The American people deserve real solutions to the desired outcome of affordable care, and that is markets that are free to create any number, any variety of products and services and people who are free to choose those products and what is best for them and their families.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED).

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to correct an injustice and to urge passage of this resolution that will put the United States House back on the side of the people and protecting their healthcare.

For far too long, seeking to fulfill empty partisan promises at the expense of the American people, politicians in Congress have sought to tear apart the Affordable Care Act and its protections for people with preexisting conditions. That ends today.

When the American people chose this new Congress, they said: Enough with the sabotage and the kowtowing to special interests seeking to divide us.

Too many times this very body has voted against the American people to repeal the Affordable Care Act and, with it, the protections for people with preexisting conditions. Now, a Federal court has put at risk those same protections.

That brings me to the story of Natalie. As I traveled around my district, which I am now truly honored to represent, I met Natalie. She told me her story.

She was a lawyer with young children, Hugo and Mia, and was married to a law professor at Southern Methodist University. I met with her on the same day that the House had voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I learned that Natalie had stage IV cancer and that she had come to my event from her chemotherapy treatment. She explained to me that her goal was to fight her cancer as long as possible so that her children would know her.

Natalie came to my event that day because she was worried about future moms like her who would lose their care if the Affordable Care Act was repealed. Natalie was worried about a return to the bad old days, with lifetime caps and discrimination against people with preexisting conditions. She knew that, because of her treatment, she would have blown through any lifetime cap in a matter of weeks.

Stories like Natalie's are all too common across America.

Tomorrow will be 1 year, to the day, since we lost Natalie, and she is still an inspiration to me and to many other north Texans and Americans across the

country. You see, Madam Speaker, Natalie spent her final days, while she was in pain, while she was saying her good-byes, emailing and posting on social media and talking to her community about the need to protect the Affordable Care Act so that other moms could get the care that they need.

That is who we are as north Texans, and that is who we are as Americans. We believe in something larger than ourselves. We believe in protecting 130 million Americans and more than 320,000 people in my district in north Texas who have a preexisting condition.

Let me be clear. The Affordable Care Act is not perfect, and this resolution does not solve all the healthcare problems facing our country. But, as one of our first acts, I hope that this measure tells the American people that we are on their side.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that this Congress will not stop working for the American people. We will not relent to the special interests and the forces of cynicism. The American people now, more than ever, need us to work together to address the rising cost of healthcare. Americans like Natalie and her family deserve no less.

Madam Speaker, it is truly an honor to address this body for the first time, and it is my first act to lead this resolution to defend the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), my very good friend and former chairman of the House Intelligence Committee and current ranking member of that committee.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I am struggling to understand what we are doing here today. We already know that the Democrats go to great lengths to defend the unconstitutional Affordable Care Act.

They really believe that Congress can and should force the American people to buy something, whether they want it or not. We know this because they made everyone vote on this same provision in title I of the rules package last week. Now we are here voting on the same thing this week.

“Why?” some Americans may ask. Because Democrats are trying to sell this farce as a vote to protect people with preexisting conditions.

But this is not a healthcare vote. This is a vote to give cover because the law they passed was unconstitutional, and the individual mandate was deeply unpopular.

They could put an end to this by passing a law that abides by the Constitution, but they are not willing to do that. Instead, we are wasting time here today voting on something for the second time.

Republicans know that we can protect the people with preexisting health conditions without infringing on basic freedoms. This is why, last week, we

voted on an amendment to the rules package to guarantee no American citizen can be denied health insurance coverage as a result of a preexisting condition.

□ 1600

I voted to ensure that no American citizen can be charged a higher premium or cost sharing as a result of a preexisting condition.

But the majority would rather spend time and taxpayer money defending the constitutionality of the ACA’s individual mandate. They seem to have forgotten that the Supreme Court told them, back in 2012, that Congress does not have the power to make the American people purchase a product.

The Democrats should not spend more taxpayer money defending the indefensible.

Congress should focus its energy on making healthcare more affordable and giving people meaningful choice in healthcare again.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of title III of the House rules package. A district court recently ruled that the entire Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional, and, sadly, President Trump’s Justice Department did nothing to defend the Affordable Care Act. They even urged the judge to strike down protections to those with preexisting conditions.

Now, I have heard and I understand my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don’t like the Affordable Care Act, but not to defend it, not to talk about the benefits, is not defensible. I have heard many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about how they want to protect those with preexisting conditions. Well, this is one way to protect those with preexisting conditions.

I see this as a doctor. I don’t want to go back to the days when I would see patients who had cancer, had diabetes, had heart conditions, and through no action on their own, lost their health insurance. I don’t want to go back to the days where the health insurance companies could deny people those coverages—often necessary lifesaving therapies and coverage. This is about doing the right thing for America’s patients. That is why we are here.

Now, what title III of the rules package does is it says that the House of Representatives should intervene in *Texas v. United States*. If this lawsuit succeeds, it is going to repeal the Affordable Care Act with no solution. None. Millions of Americans are going to lose their health insurance coverage.

The American public spoke loud and clear. They want this body to sit down, to come together to provide coverage for America—affordable coverage. That is what we need to do as Democrats and Republicans. I urge my colleagues to vote for title III and to make it clear this Congress will protect those with preexisting conditions.

I have got friends on the other side of the aisle. I heard many of them talk about how they want to protect those with preexisting conditions. A vote against title III of the rules package is a vote against protecting those Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to make a quick point.

Actually, a vote against this provision is not a vote against preexisting conditions. It is a vote to limit the power of the Speaker—not to allow the Speaker to, on her own, decide whether she is going to intervene in law cases where, frankly, the intervention of this House isn’t necessary. There are States litigating against the ACA. There are States litigating for the ACA. The idea that either side is unrepresented, I think, just doesn’t bear serious scrutiny.

So, you know, not only is it an exercise in futility, in my opinion, it is an exercise that is totally unnecessary because we have already given the Speaker that power. The majority has already seen fit to do that. So why we are wasting time, money, and effort in this particular exercise eludes me.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank Secretary SHALALA for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I feel like I have a preexisting condition. It is arguing about the Affordable Care Act. For 10 years we have argued about the Affordable Care Act. A campaign is part of forming a government, and no issue resonated with the American people in the last election like the issue of preexisting conditions.

My friend, the gentleman from California, previously said he didn’t understand why people had to buy something that they didn’t want. Well, we require people to buy automobile insurance. And, by the way, you don’t buy automobile insurance the day after you have been in an automobile accident. And we probably don’t want to buy homeowners insurance, but, guess what; we don’t buy it the day after our house is burned down. We buy it because the genius of insurance is the spreading of risk.

So I ask the following rhetorical question, and that is, why should the rest of us annually put \$1,000 into our premiums for health insurance to take care of those who don’t want to buy health insurance?

So what this discussion and argument is really about, for the moment, is the following: The child who is born with diabetes is then told, under the old system, that they can never buy health insurance, or, if they do, it has to be rated—back to the old actuarial argument about how do we spread risk.

The protections that were built into the Affordable Care Act, which I helped

to write, were based upon the idea of using the best principles of the marketplace while simultaneously using the ability of the Federal Government to prod certain behaviors, and those behaviors included a ban on preexisting conditions as an option for people who didn't want to buy health insurance.

So what did the other side do? They filed the lawsuit. Now, they generally lecture us on activist judges. They decided that they would challenge what has become okay with the American people, the Affordable Care Act. They would challenge it in the Federal courts and really didn't want to bring down the entire Affordable Care Act. Instead, they wanted to disassemble piece by piece parts of the Affordable Care Act that really, in a lot of ways, have made for its success.

There is no argument with the following statistic that, today, between 17 and 20 million Americans have health insurance that didn't have it before the Affordable Care Act.

And back to those people who, by the way, their system of healthcare was the emergency room. So, in the emergency room, we all know, it is a pretty poor way to get health insurance because it really doesn't emphasize preventive care.

So all of these options that we built into the Affordable Care Act, including making sure that people that had preexisting conditions couldn't be exploited in the marketplace with undue costs, this argument that we continue to have, Madam Speaker, here about the Affordable Care Act could be rectified in short order by both sides just working together to improve the Affordable Care Act.

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

Madam Speaker, to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means, I think that offer is made quite sincerely, and I think it will be taken up by our side. We can work together in a bipartisan way to do exactly what the gentleman suggests.

In my opinion, this particular measure doesn't do that. It doesn't get us anywhere. It involves us in litigation unnecessarily, and it doesn't—by the way, for the second time, since we gave the Speaker this authority—I didn't vote for it, my friends did, that is their right, she has it, so why we are here on the floor today arguing about it mystifies me.

But, again, I know my friend's offer is made in good faith. I think it will be taken up in good faith. We should work together to do exactly what my friend suggests, that is, guarantee that every American is protected from preexisting conditions and able to go into the marketplace and buy insurance at a practical and reasonable rate that they can afford.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I thank—I call her the Secretary. She is one of my colleagues now. Congresswoman SHALALA knows more about healthcare, and, I should say, probably is more of an expert on it than anybody else in this body.

I want to basically contradict what my Republican colleagues have been saying. They are saying that this is not about preexisting conditions. That is exactly what this debate is about.

We have seen the Republicans in the House, the President, consistently try to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. And what does that mean? That means sabotage to make it more difficult for people with preexisting conditions to get coverage. It means bringing out junk insurance that doesn't have good benefits. It means bringing back all the discriminatory practices that existed before the ACA, like lifetime or annual limits or rescissions.

You know, before the Affordable Care Act, you could actually buy a policy and the insurance company could come in and rescind the policy because they were spending too much money on your insurance policy. We worked very hard with the ACA to get rid of all these discriminatory practices. They would come back again if this lawsuit succeeds.

I don't think there should be any mistake. This lawsuit, brought by a group of Republican attorneys general, is nothing more than a continuation of Republican efforts to sabotage the healthcare of millions of Americans. Having failed to repeal the law through the legislative process, Republicans are attempting to invalidate the law through the Federal courts, and they have, at least for now, succeeded at the district court level.

Last month, Judge Reed O'Connor of the Northern District of Texas declared the entire ACA was invalid. His decision would eliminate the law's protections for preexisting conditions, as well as entirely unrelated provisions, such as the Medicaid expansion and the closing of the Medicare prescription drug donut hole.

This decision has been roundly criticized by legal scholars. Conservative scholars, like Jonathan Adler, joined with other scholars in writing that the decision was a mockery of the rule of law and basic principles of democracy. Judge O'Connor's decision is an exercise in raw judicial power. It is not the job of the Federal judges to strike down entire statutes without considering what Congress intended.

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

Madam Speaker, I am always delighted when my friends on the other side believe in judicial restraint, so it is nice to see we have some new converts in that.

I just make my basic point again, Madam Speaker. We are here for no

particular reason debating something that we did last week, giving that power to the Speaker. I didn't agree with that vote. We had an opportunity last week, actually, to take up a Republican measure that would have legislatively guaranteed protections for preexisting. The majority chose not to do that. So I have just forced back on the conclusion that this is much more about political theater than it is about genuine substance.

I will say, though, in disagreeing with my good friend from New Jersey, I am not a lawyer. I don't pretend to be able to be an expert judge of the legal merits, but I do think I would not so blithely dismiss 20 State attorneys general and a court that ruled in their favor. It tells me that there are significant legal issues here and that those legal issues are going to be litigated in due course.

What mystifies me is why we need to be involved in it since there is high-powered law from different States with different points of view that are in this right now.

So, again, I see no particular reason to do this, although, with all due respect, my friends have already given the Speaker the power to do it, so I don't know why we need to do it a second time. But, again, I am here to represent my colleagues on my side of the aisle, and we will continue to do that.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution to intervene against the egregious Texas v. United States lawsuit that seeks to end the Affordable Care Act, or, as I like to call it, the Civil Rights Act of the 21st Century.

In a few days, we are going to be celebrating the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who once said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane."

Since the ACA was enacted, significant progress has been made to lessen the inequality in our healthcare delivery system. To dismantle those life-saving protections now is unfounded and unjust.

It is unjust to deny those with preexisting conditions access to healthcare. It is unjust to cut off insurance coverage to a child with cancer because she has reached her maximum lifetime benefits. It is unjust to charge women more than we charge men for healthcare simply because of their gender. It is unjust to increase the cost of seniors' medications by reopening the gap known as the donut hole in their Medicare prescription drug coverage.

□ 1615

It is unjust to tell young people just starting out in life that they can no

longer remain on their parents' insurance policies.

It is unjust to reinstitute charges for preventative healthcare, costing more money in the long run when illnesses go undetected for too long.

It is unjust to ask the working poor not eligible for Medicaid to purchase private insurance at the market rate when they are struggling to feed their families and keep a roof over their heads.

Access to quality healthcare ought not only be for those who can afford it; it ought to be for those who need it. It is unfortunate for us to deny healthcare to people just because they were born unhealthy.

A vote against this resolution is a vote against providing the basic human right to fair and equitable access to quality, affordable healthcare for all Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, let me advise my friend, I am prepared to close. I see she has additional speakers, so, for the moment, I will simply reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, being sort of last in this debate gives you an opportunity to hear all of the arguments.

The question has been asked: Why should we allow Speaker PELOSI to intervene? Well, she authored the bill. We need her to defend this bill, and we believe that she has standing.

Another question that was raised was about an initiative that was offered last week and that this is just a theater here today. Well, I was here the 60-plus times that we tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That is the true theater.

And let me tell you something, Madam Speaker. Why do we think that there was such a strident effort to destroy the Affordable Care Act? Because our colleagues have told us it cost a lot of money, and we have tried to prevent insurers from maximizing their profits.

And how do they maximize their profits? By denying the sickest people with preexisting conditions—like the people I met today, the kids with neurofibromatosis, a serious illness that causes tumors all through your body and causes you to wake up in pain every single day—if you can get rid of them, then you won't have to pay much money; to impose lifetime limits on coverage not just for people under the ACA, but for everybody, including those folks who get employer-based insurance.

Why have they tried to deny health coverage to consumers, to provide essential health benefits? Because they want to provide these skeletal benefits, this fig leaf of provisions for folks.

So I think that we need someone like Speaker PELOSI to intervene, and I think that she should have standing, and this body ought to authorize it.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, last month, a judge delivered a ruling to gut the Affordable Care Act, a warning shot that was fired at millions of Americans of all ages, backgrounds, and beliefs. The decision changed little immediately, but that didn't matter. Patients again panicked because, yes, they have been here before.

The family with a young child who will spend their entire life battling diabetes, the father in remission, the young woman facing addiction desperately seeking treatment, over the past 2 years, they have watched their government, led by a Republican Congress and a reckless President, come after their healthcare coverage again and again and again.

So families wake up wondering if this is the day. Is this the day where they succeed, the day the President finally wins, the day my coverage goes away, the day I have to face my loved ones, my kids, my ailing parents, and tell them that we can't afford the care to make their suffering go away?

They deserve better, and that is why I ask everyone to support this rules package.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I inquire whether the gentleman from Oklahoma is prepared to close. I am prepared to close on my side.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, actually, I know I informed the gentlewoman differently, but my good friend, Mr. BURGESS, got so excited by the debate he came back and asked for an additional minute. So if I may, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I would just ask a simple question: What has happened to your insurance premium since the passage of the Affordable Care Act? They have gone up. They have gone up a lot.

What has happened to the cost of prescription drugs since the passage of the Affordable Care Act? They have gone up. They have gone up a lot.

All I would suggest is there was a better way to go about this. Republicans have offered ideas. It really, really would behoove us to work on behalf of the American people to solve these problems rather than to continue to push this bill that has been so unfavorable in the eyes of so many Americans.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this measure. The majority is asking the House of Representatives to authorize the Speaker to intervene in a lawsuit over the legality of the Affordable Care Act. Such an act is unnecessary and wasteful.

It should have been obvious to the majority that the Affordable Care Act

was and is poorly written and precariously unbalanced as Republicans warned them at the time it was passed, and the intervening years have brought those predictions to come about. Premiums have skyrocketed. Insurers have fled the market. The American consumers have suffered as a result.

The appropriate solution is not to intervene in a lawsuit but, instead, to spend time working with Republicans to craft a replacement fix to this broken system. And moreover, it is certainly not to do today, in a rule, what we have already done in the same rule last week.

Madam Speaker, I have enjoyed the debate, but I am not exactly sure why we had it. Again, it is always worthwhile to spend time on the floor with my friends.

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I thank my distinguished colleague.

It has been more than 9 years since Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. It has withstood dozens of repeal attempts, and the Supreme Court already has held it constitutional. Now a district court in Texas has determined that the whole law should be null and void.

But the ACA is now so enmeshed in our society that we sometimes forget the numerous benefits that are now threatened by this case. It is not simply protections for preexisting conditions. It is subsidies to help the middle-class families and small businesses to buy health insurance. It is caps on out-of-pocket health insurance costs. It is an end to annual and lifetime limits.

No matter where someone gets their healthcare, they have something to lose if this case is upheld. Madam Speaker, that is why the House of Representatives must intervene in this case. We need to stand with the American people, the overwhelming majority of whom support the crucial benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

The administration is unwilling to intervene in this case and protect the rights of Americans; thus, it is up to Congress to defend and uphold this law and all of the crucial protections it provides for our citizens.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the portion of the divided question comprising title III.

The question is on that portion of the divided 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 the portion of the divided question comprising title III will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 264; and

Passage of H.R. 264.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 192, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—192

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Armstrong

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

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1650

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

So the portion of the divided question comprising title III was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 227, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—200

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

NAYS—227

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline
Aguilar	F.	Cisneros
Allred	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)
Amash	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Axne	Bustos	Clay
Barragán	Butterfield	Cleaver
Bass	Carbajal	Clyburn
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bera	Carson (IN)	Connolly
Beyer	Cartwright	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Case	Correa
Blumenauer	Casten (IL)	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Cox (CA)
	Chu, Judy	Craig

Crist	Kind	Price (NC)	Case	Hoyer	Phillips	Graves (MO)	Marshall	Scott, Austin
Crow	Kirkpatrick	Quigley	Casten (IL)	Huffman	Pingree	Green (TN)	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin	Castor (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Pocan	Griffith	McCarthy	Shimkus
Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)	Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Porter	Grothman	McCaul	Simpson
Davids (KS)	Langevin	Richmond	Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Pressley	Guest	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rouda	Cicilline	Jeffries	Price (NC)	Guthrie	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Davis, Danny K.	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard	Cisneros	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Hagedorn	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Dean	Lawrence	Ruiz	Clark (MA)	Johnson (TX)	Raskin	Harris	Meadows	Smucker
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger	Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Hartzler	Meuser	Spano
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Rush	Clay	Katko	Richmond	Hern, Kevin	Miller	Staubert
DeLauro	Lee (NV)	Ryan	Cleaver	Keating	Rose (NY)	Hice (GA)	Mitchell	Steil
DeBene	Levin (CA)	Sánchez	Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Rouda	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Steube
Delgado	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes	Cohen	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard	Hill (AR)	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Demings	Lewis	Scanlon	Connolly	Khanna	Ruiz	Holding	Mullin	Stivers
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Cooper	Kildee	Ruppersberger	Hollingsworth	Newhouse	Taylor
Deutch	Lipinski	Schiff	Correa	Kilmer	Rush	Hudson	Norman	Thompson (PA)
Dingell	Loeb	Schneider	Costa	Kim	Ryan	Huizenga	Nunes	Thornberry
Doggett	Lofgren	Schrader	Courtney	Kind	Sanchez	Hunter	Olson	Timmons
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Schrier	Cox (CA)	Kinzinger	Sarbanes	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Tipton
F.	Lowey	Scott (VA)	Craig	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon	Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Turner
Engel	Lujan	Scott, David	Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Johnson (SD)	Johnson (SD)	Pence	Wagner
Escobar	Luria	Serrano	Crow	Kuster (NH)	Jordan	Joyce (OH)	Perry	Walberg
Eshoo	Lynch	Sewell (AL)	Cuellar	Lamb	Schiff	Joyce (PA)	Posey	Walker
Espallat	Malinowski	Shalala	Cummings	Langevin	Schneider	Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Walorski
Evans	Maloney	Shalala	Cunningham	Larsen (WA)	Schrader	Kelly (PA)	Reed	Waltz
Finkenauer	Carolyn B.	Sherman	Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Schrier	King (IA)	Reschenthaler	Watkins
Fletcher	Maloney, Sean	Sires	Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Scott (VA)	King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Foster	Massie	Slotkin	Davis, Danny K.	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David	Kustoff (TN)	Riggleman	Webster (FL)
Fudge	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Dean	Lee (CA)	Serrano	LaHood	Roby	Wenstrup
Gabbard	McAdams	Soto	DeFazio	Lee (NV)	Sewell (AL)	LaMalfa	Rodgers (WA)	Westerman
Gallego	McBath	Spanberger	DeGette	Levin (CA)	Shalala	Lamborn	Roe, David P.	Williams
Garamendi	McCollum	Speier	DeLauro	Levin (MI)	Sherman	Latta	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Garcia (IL)	McEachin	Stanton	DelBene	Lewis	Sherrill	Lesko	Rogers (KY)	Wittman
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Stevens	Delgado	Lieu, Ted	Sires	Long	Rooney (FL)	Womack
Gomez	McNerney	Suozi	Demings	Lipinski	Slotkin	Long	Rose, John W.	Woodall
Gonzalez (TX)	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)	DeSaulnier	Loeb	Smith (WA)	Rouzer	Rutherford	Yoho
Green (TX)	Meng	Takano	Deutch	Lofgren	Soto	Lucas	Scalise	Young
Grijalva	Moore	Thompson (CA)	Dingell	Lowenthal	Spanberger	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	Zeldin
Haaland	Morelle	Thompson (MS)	Doggett	Lowey	Speier	Marchant		
Harder (CA)	Moulton	Titus	Doyle, Michael	Lujan	Stanton	Marino		
Hastings	Mucarsel-Powell	Tlaib	F.	Luria	Stefanik			
Hayes	Murphy	Tonko	Engel	Lynch	Stevens			
Heck	Nadler	Torres (CA)	Escobar	Malinowski	Suozi			
Higgins (NY)	Napolitano	Torres Small	Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)			
Hill (CA)	Neal	(NM)	Espallat	Matsui	Takano			
Himes	Neguse	Trahan	Evans	McAdams	Thompson (CA)			
Horn, Kendra S.	Norcross	Trone	Finkenauer	McBath	Thompson (MS)			
Horsford	O'Halleran	Underwood	Fitzpatrick	McCollum				
Houlahan	Ocasio-Cortez	Van Drew	Fletcher	McEachin				
Hoyer	Omar	Vargas	Foster	McGovern				
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Veasey	Fudge	McNerney				
Jayapal	Panetta	Vela	Gabbard	Meeks				
Jeffries	Pappas	Velázquez	Gallego	Meng				
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Visclosky	Garamendi	Moore				
Johnson (TX)	Payne	Wasserman	Garcia (IL)	Morelle				
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Schultz	Garcia (TX)	Moulton				
Keating	Peters	Waters	Golden	Mucarsel-Powell				
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Watson Coleman	Gomez	Murphy				
Kennedy	Phillips	Welch	Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler				
Khanna	Pingree	Wexton	Gottheimer	Napolitano				
Kildee	Pocan	Wild	Green (TX)	Neal				
Kilmer	Porter	Wilson (FL)	Grijalva	Neguse				
Kim	Pressley	Yarmuth	Haaland	Norcross				
			Harder (CA)	O'Halleran				
			Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez				
			Hayes	Omar				
			Heck	Pallone				
			Herrera Beutler	Panetta				
			Higgins (NY)	Pappas				
			Hill (CA)	Pascrell				
			Himes	Payne				
			Horn, Kendra S.	Perlmutter				
			Horsford	Peters				
			Houlahan	Peterson				

NOT VOTING—6

Amodei Frankel Jones
Buck Guest Mast

□ 1700

Ms. SHALALA changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 188, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—240

Adams Beyer Brown (MD)
Aguilar Bishop (GA) Brownley (CA)
Allred Blumenauer Bustos
Axne Blunt Rochester Butterfield
Barragán Bonamici Carbajal
Bass Boyle, Brendan Cárdenas
Beatty F. Carson (IN)
Bera Brindisi Cartwright

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—5

Buck Jones Maloney,
Frankel Carolyn B.
Mast

□ 1709

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

END SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, 19 days into the Trump shutdown, there is no end in sight. Real Americans are taking his blows.

Take Ms. J's story. She is a constituent of mine who is a contractor for NASA Glenn Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio.

With the Trump shutdown now into the third week, she faces unnecessary anxiety and uncertainty on whether she will be paid. Yes, President Trump is making America's workers bear the brunt of his shutdown.

Ms. J must weigh which bills to pay if her paycheck doesn't come. As the mother of four, she fears the loss of health insurance coverage if she can't cover her monthly premium. She describes herself as lucky to be in a two-income household with the education necessary to seek employment elsewhere if it comes to the worst.

Others are not so fortunate. One of her colleagues is an 81-year-old custodial worker who has dedicated more than 30 years doing the toilsome work required of her profession. Ms. J asks: “Who will look out for her?”

It is over time to end the Trump shutdown, and the taxpaying public at large expects the Government of the United States to do the work they pay for.

□ 1715

RECOGNIZING DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF JAY TIBSHRAENY

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the distinguished career of Jay Tibshraeny, who has served the community of Chandler, Arizona, for more than 30 years. He has just completed his seventh term as mayor after being elected as a judge in the Maricopa County Justice Court. The city of Chandler experienced tremendous growth under Mayor Tibshraeny's leadership.

Mayor Tibshraeny has not only served in office for decades, he has faithfully served his community his entire life. Chandler would not be the same without his presence and his tireless efforts to leave his city better than when he found it.

Madam Speaker, Chandler will miss his leadership. It was my honor and privilege to work with him for the benefit of our constituents. I wish him and his family the best in their next chapter of life.

PROTECTING SNAP

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

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, right now, 12,643 Pennsylvanians are being denied a paycheck because of a partisan fight they have no control over. It is time to end this shutdown and restore our government's ability to protect our country and deliver vital services to our people.

The longer this shutdown goes on, the worse the impact will be, not just on Federal workers, but on the communities that depend on them. Unless we act, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, will be at risk. Over 94,000 families in my district depend on SNAP, and national data shows that over 40 percent of beneficiaries are children.

I have heard from food banks in my community that they expect a twelve-fold increase in people who need assistance if SNAP recipients don't receive their benefits. That is unacceptable.

We must reaffirm our most fundamental duty: to stand with and support our most vulnerable constituents. Let's act to protect people across this country from hunger and malnutrition by protecting SNAP and reopening the government.

MOURNING THE DEATH OF PIERCE CORCORAN

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart to speak about my constituent, Pierce Corcoran. On December 29, 2018, Pierce was struck and killed by a vehicle operated by an undocumented immigrant in Knoxville.

This is a personal matter for me, Madam Speaker, because I have been friends with Pierce's family for many years, and they remain in my prayers. Pierce was an incredible, hardworking, fine Christian young man who will be deeply missed.

People want to come to our country for new opportunities and the pursuit of happiness, and this Nation is full of incentives that attract not only legal, but also illegal immigrants. The most recent data shows that there are approximately 606,000 overstayed visa recipients and 10.7 million unauthorized immigrants.

Removing incentives that encourage unlawful immigration and demagnetizing that attraction must be a priority for Congress moving forward.

With stronger laws and increased border security, tragedies like the one that occurred in my home district could and should be avoided, and families like Pierce's might be saved from such a heartbreaking situation.

REFORMERS CAUCUS

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

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act, of which I am a very proud cosponsor.

H.R. 1 is a critical step toward reversing the accelerating deterioration in our Nation's most cherished democratic foundation—the consent of the governed—and taking back our government for all citizens. It would fight voter suppression; simplify voting; promote election security; curb special interests and dark money in politics; incentivize smaller, broader donations; and fortify ethics laws.

I wish especially to recognize contributions of Issue One and its Reformers Caucus. These over 200 now-former Members of Congress, Cabinet members, and Governors have dedicated themselves on a nonpartisan basis to "Fix Democracy First." My own motivation to return to Congress arose from my membership in this caucus, and my pledge to my constituents in Hawaii and throughout the country was and is to fight to fully return our government to the governed again.

H.R. 1 is first and foremost for the people, and I urge its prompt passage. Everything else depends on that.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHERYL DOZIER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Cheryl Dozier, who will be retiring as president of Savannah State University on July 31.

Dr. Dozier served for 8 years as the 13th president of Savannah State, a historically Black university located in the First Congressional District of Georgia. Because of her work, the university has made a number of exceptional improvements in different areas.

Dr. Dozier reactivated the honors program, with more than 70 students participating. She established a college of education offering a bachelor of science in education, created a scholarship to help students who needed emergency financial support in their last semester, and opened two new STEM buildings.

Thank you, Dr. Dozier, for your work educating students in coastal Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I wish Savannah State University the best of luck in finding their next president.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to put a human face on the detrimental impact this government shutdown has on real people, many who are our most vulnerable, especially our children who deserve for us to lead with compassion.

Our families depend on the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD. Right now, Madam Speaker, landlords are being asked to spare families from eviction because HUD funding expired and they are desperately trying to find reserve funds to help our residents. This is not right.

In Wayne County, Michigan, there are low-income families, elderly and disabled residents, and over 450 housing units whose contracts have expired with another 150 expiring this month. Make no question, they cannot fly to Mar-a-Lago to stay warm in the middle of winter.

The shutdown has caused HUD to halt health and safety inspections, putting our most vulnerable citizens yet again in harm's way. These folks will suffer due to Trump's shutdown.

Madam Speaker, the President gets to sleep soundly while he plays political and partisan games and the lives of Americans are put in harm's way. I uplift my neighbors and ask that they know that people here do care about them.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

(Mr. YOHIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of Law Enforcement Appreciation Day to show my support and utmost respect for peace officers across the Nation.

Sadly, last year, we lost over 100 law enforcement officers in the line of duty. Of that number, three came from my hometown. I am reminded today of the continued sacrifice these officers make and the dangers they face day after day and night after night.

It is important that we always show our appreciation for those who work tirelessly to keep us safe. A lesson could be learned from them on service. They serve people, communities, and a nation, not political ideologies.

This selfless service is both physically and mentally demanding on officers and their families. So, today, we honor not only those who serve but those who serve alongside them.

Law enforcement officers deserve our utmost respect and recognition today and every day. Please join me in thanking these brave men and women for their sacrifices and service to our country and our communities.

CONGRATULATING DAN DAVIDSON, ORANGE COUNTY'S FOOTBALL COACH OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Western High School championship-winning football coach Dan Davidson on being named Orange County's Football Coach of the Year. Coach Davidson led the Western High School Pioneers to the first-ever CIF championship.

Coach Davidson built a winning team of hardworking young men—inner city kids, average athletes—and made them believe in themselves and hard work.

Do you know what? They won CIF this year in Orange County.

I want to congratulate Coach Davidson because not only did he create and build a football team of winners, but he also changed the lives of many students in central Orange County.

Coach Davidson, congratulations. All of us in Orange County are proud of you. Keep up the good work.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the speech the President gave last night. I was disturbed to see that some people, in dealing with the crisis, including a leader on the other side of the aisle, said that some people felt that a wall would be immoral. There are people on late-night talk shows saying we don't have a crisis here.

I am going to point out that 90 percent of the heroin that comes in this country, that kills over tens of thousands of people every year in this country, comes across the border. I don't see how anybody could be so insensitive as to say that is not a crisis and not something we have to deal with at this time.

In the last 10 years in Texas alone, they have arrested over 2,900 people who they believe commit homicide who have come across the border. How in the world is it not a crisis when 2,900 people—that is almost as many people who died in the Twin Towers—are killed by people who are in this country illegally? It is completely undermining our immigration law.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DAY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight in recognition of National Law Enforcement Day.

Our officers who hit the streets on behalf of our safety, we need to show them appreciation, and I do. We also need to give them better tools and better laws that make their job easier, because it is, indeed, at the end of the day, us who they are protecting.

We have things happen in California, like we saw with the tragedy, due to lack of control of our borders, with Officer Singh, who unfortunately had to give his life unnecessarily. These tragedies need to end.

On this day, as we recognize them, the thin blue line between us as citizens and the harm that could be brought to us is greatly appreciated.

For those who are always out there and every day get up, kiss their families good-bye, and, hopefully, return home at the end of that day safe as they have kept us safe, we honor them. We ask for God's blessings for safety and to return home each day intact as they keep our communities intact.

We need to do a better job of honoring them by giving them the tools, the laws, and the secure borders that would help them accomplish that.

SHUTDOWN AFFECTING FEDERAL WORKERS

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today for our veterans and government employees out of work due to the Trump shutdown. On day one, House Democrats took steps to restore certainty to people's lives by passing a complete funding package to reopen the government.

Now we are preparing further action to reopen government, so that we can meet the needs of the American people, protect our borders, and respect our workers.

In fact, one of my constituents who works for the IRS and specializes in helping hurricane victims told me that he and his wife, who is also a Federal employee, both are affected by the shutdown, and they cannot pay this month's mortgage and their other bills.

Madam Speaker, he worked 12 hours a day in the aftermath of Hurricane Michael. He was there for the people of Georgia. It is past time we reopen the government and be there for our Federal workers.

□ 1730

YEAR-END REPORT

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, there is a twofold goal being sought by many of us right now, and it is this: to keep the government fully open and to secure our border.

No one wins in a government shutdown. No one wins if the border is not safe. We ought to be able to rise above the momentary difficulty, whether it is a negotiation between the Senate and the House, the President and the House, the President and the Senate, and get to those mutually compatible goals of fully funding an operational government, as well as ensuring that Americans are safe and that we have the right type of assistance to our border personnel, the right type of barriers, the right type of technology, the right type of preventative measures to protect us all, and create the conditions in which America can have a truly just and humanitarian response to those in need. That is what is at issue this moment.

With that said, Madam Speaker, though, I think it is important that, as we are at the beginning of a new Congress, as we were all sworn in last week, as this Chamber was filled with Members' children and Members' families coming from such extraordinarily diverse backgrounds, it was a celebratory atmosphere. It always tends to be that way, and then we get into the hard, hard work of governing.

As President Kennedy once said, to govern is to choose wisely, and in a society divided by deep cultural and philosophical difficulties, that actually manifests itself here in the people's House.

It is incumbent upon those of us who have been given this awesome responsibility to govern to undertake the awesome responsibility of deciding to govern well, to carry forth that spirit of the swearing in day with our families here, and that oath of office, where there is a common narrative around who we are as a people and where we should go as a Nation, reaching back to our most honored-in-time traditions and projecting them forward so America can have confidence that we have

set up the guardrails for a successful culture, a successful economy, a successful society.

That is our job. It is going to take difficult moments of prudential wrestling. It is my hope it will be done in a civil manner and that people will make their firm case and fight for those principles, but do so with an eye toward building consensus.

We in Nebraska, I believe, invented the phrase “get ‘er done.” Just get ‘er done. Fight for what you believe and seek that which is possible. They are not mutually incompatible goals. That is our responsibility as legislators for the good, the well-being of the entire American public.

With that said, Madam Speaker, I would like to do something a little bit unique. I would actually like to look back for a moment at the year in review and some important things that were accomplished.

We tend to be caught in what I call the tyranny of the urgent, where what is right in front of us completely occupies us. Of course, we have a 24/7, 911 media that heightens all of this intensity. It is what it is. But the reality is, we did some pretty good things last year, last term, and I want to review a few of them.

In December, the House and Senate passed a new farm bill with very strong bipartisan support. For a lot of Americans, it is very easy to overlook this accomplishment. Our grocery bills are some of the lowest in the world, our food is readily available, and our safety net for those who are vulnerable is well considered.

It comes down to this: it is the vastness of our land and the quality of our soil and the gritty ingenuity of our farmers and ranchers who lay the foundation for America’s prosperity, stability, and economic vitality. We tend to forget this because our food comes somewhat easy to us.

The farm bill provides risk management tools to maximize this natural gift, allowing farmers and ranchers to provide food security for our country, our nutrition programs, as well as food assistance to millions of others around the world and protect those who are in very vulnerable circumstances.

This bill also fosters conservation practices that enhance the protection of our soil and our wildlife habitat. I am pleased by the increase in the number of acres in the Conservation Reserve Program.

The farm bill ensures that America continues to lead the world in agricultural innovation, food safety, and renewable fuels. In Nebraska, agriculture is central to our well-being, our way of life, and our culture. Our land-grant universities help ensure that we maintain our tremendous productivity.

The farm bill is a once-in-every-5-year piece of legislation. The birth of such legislation is neither smooth nor easy, but we got it done. It is a good lesson for what we are facing now with new challenges ahead of us. We got it done in a very strong, bipartisan vote.

For Nebraskans, and many people throughout rural America, the farm bill is not just another Washington accomplishment. Like the rhythms of planting and harvesting, it is an expected rite of legislative passage essential to who we are as a people, as Americans, and to our well-being.

One of the things that I am excited about, Madam Speaker, is that beginning farmers and local food producers are big winners in our farm bill. I am very encouraged by the growing interest of young people in seeking agricultural opportunity.

We are witnessing a food culture awakening, with local chefs, farmers markets, and a keen interest in eating local. The farm bill helps these next generation farmers and food entrepreneurs through new resources and training, such as the Local Agriculture Market Program, called LAMP, which accelerates the farm-to-fork movement across America, connecting local farmers with families, consumers, and restaurants. This offers a big, big opportunity for us all.

I am also happy, Madam Speaker, that the farm bill includes my provisions to enhance the Farmer-to-Farmer Program. For over 30 years, the Farmer-to-Farmer Program has connected volunteer American farmers, agriculture extension experts, and others with deep knowledge of the agriculture industry with the world’s farmers abroad. From dairy production to seed selection to entomology, irrigation, and crop yield determination improvement, as well as farm credit, this sharing of America’s agricultural expertise dramatically enhances the capacity of people elsewhere to grow their own food, contributing to worldwide food security, community well-being, and human flourishing. Food security is the key.

This year, we also passed the Global Food Security Reauthorization Act. I had worked on this important piece of legislation when it first passed. It amends the Global Security Act of 2016 to enable programs that support sustainable agriculture around the world and it extends assistance for international disaster relief and rehabilitation, especially for emergency food programs.

Switching topics a bit, Madam Speaker, the fundamental duty that we all have here is to keep America safe. This requires a modern and properly equipped military.

In recent years, our force structure has significantly deteriorated. Planes could not fly in certain circumstances and other equipment was not available.

This past year in Congress, we passed the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act and the defense appropriations bill. Again, most of the government is open and functioning. We are working toward the rest. This helps rebuild our military after years of budget cuts. Our Active Duty, National Guard, and reserve force personnel will receive a 2.6 percent pay raise, the largest in 9

years. We are going to purchase new aircraft, tanks, ships, and other military hardware to replace and upgrade worn out equipment. These bills also increase across-the-board funding for additional personnel, training, maintenance, and operations to ensure that our military is always ready to defend our Nation.

Madam Speaker, while a strong military is vital, America’s safety and prosperity also depends upon a skillful mix of diplomacy and development. Building authentic relationships around the world and attacking the root causes of structural poverty are equally important goals that need to work in tandem with a properly sized and prepared military.

A race toward technological superiority through ever-larger weapons systems will not unilaterally resolve our most difficult security challenges. The tech gap that we enjoy is closing, and will continue to close rapidly.

Then, we have to ask ourselves: Then what?

I often use the phrase “foreign policy realism” to guide how I believe the United States should engage in global affairs. It is this: strong defense, smart diplomacy, and sustainable development. These are the three pillars.

Thanks to the dedication and courage of our troops and our diplomats and the exhaustive work of many others who serve from their heart in far-away places, we ought to be very grateful that our country has been kept safe from attack. There is always a however. However, real risks remain.

Northern Iraq and Syria are places where ISIS and other dark forces could regenerate. Iran meddles and frustrates peace throughout the region. The United States’ relationship with Saudi Arabia is under severe scrutiny in light of our intelligence findings that implicated the Saudi Crown Prince in the murder of an American-based Saudi journalist. We also face risks from various actors to increasingly powerful, yet more nimble and mobile nuclear capabilities.

Madam Speaker, I lead the Nuclear Security Working Group in Congress. We had a very important dialogue with the administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration as we closed out the last Congress to discuss our coordination of nuclear non-proliferation activities.

There are two core elements in preventing an attack. The first, of course, is deterrence. The second is threat reduction. Again, the dual work of our military and other government efforts in nuclear threat reduction has been successful in preventing nuclear and radiological terrorism.

The challenge is to constantly reassess the changing threat environment. A single failure can lead to catastrophic consequences. These efforts must be matched with an equal effort to halt and reverse nuclear proliferation throughout the world.

In a September conference, we gathered with national and nuclear security

experts and former government officials across four administrations with the singular goal to improve U.S. Government oversight and coordination of nuclear counter and nonproliferation efforts. As a result, I am going to propose the creation of a nuclear nonproliferation council to enable a unified U.S. Government strategy on nuclear nonproliferation.

In the National Defense Authorization Act, which we passed, there is a section also that perhaps has been overlooked, but it is important. It will speed the elimination of cesium chloride that can be used to make dirty bombs. This policy change that we were pleased to work on reduces the risk of a catastrophic radiological attack inside our borders.

In the face of expanding Russian and Chinese nuclear arsenals, our defense bill modernizes our nuclear deterrence capability even as we hope to reestablish a more stable and peaceful world. Only through a combination of strength and an openness to dialogue can we avert a nuclear arms race.

□ 1745

Back in June, the first-ever meeting between leaders of the United States and North Korea took place. President Trump met face to face with Kim Jong-un in a preliminary step towards reconciliation and denuclearization.

The summit that was held in Singapore was a first step to shift an escalating trajectory of missile launches and hostile rhetoric, reducing anxiety for the region, America, and the world.

The summit took a new approach to a long standoff. For the first time, a U.S. President reached out directly to a North Korean leader. The meeting would not have happened, though—and this is very important, Madam Speaker—without a unified global community willing to support the preconditions needed to encourage Kim Jong-un to meet.

As an initial gesture of goodwill, North Korea returned the remains of U.S. service personnel and destroyed at least one nuclear testing facility.

Clearly, much more progress is needed, and a joint action plan will require North Korea to continue to earnestly engage in nonproliferation.

I believe that congressional leadership should play a role here in policy developments that can help the administration reduce the nuclear threats on the Korean Peninsula.

Now, Madam Speaker, where I live, Nebraska, plays a critical role in keeping America safe. Offutt Air Force Base and Strategic Command are essential to America's security, and the steady work of guiding budgets and building the necessary coalitions here in Congress resulted in dramatic improvements to both Strategic Command as well as Offutt.

The new USSTRATCOM headquarters building is nearing completion. Its increased capability, beginning this summer, will add to the com-

batant command's charge as one of the Nation's most vital missions, and that is nuclear deterrence.

A major repair of Offutt Air Force Base's runway will soon begin.

Again, I am very pleased, working with the Nebraska delegation and our colleagues, to continue to advance the completion of the Strategic Command as well as the enhancement of Offutt Air Force Base.

Offutt is home to the Air Force's 55th Wing. The wing conducts intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions. This is very important, Madam Speaker, because, again, it is something that is overlooked in our tense times.

One of the 55th Wing's important aircraft is the OC-135B. It flies in support of the 34-international-member Treaty on Open Skies, one of the last remaining functional arms control regimes that is operational between the United States and the Russian Federation.

I am pleased that, working together, we were able to enhance funding for the OC-135B aircraft, again, vital to one of the last linkages of agreements with the Russians.

Madam Speaker, I want to turn to another topic that really ought to be at the forefront of our discussions, but rarely is; if we are going to create a 21st century architecture for international stability, I believe it revolves around two words: human dignity.

We traditionally think of diplomacy as between nation-states. Increasingly in our interconnected world, where people can reach people in faraway places in an instant or by travel in a very short period of time, it is this deeper transcendent idea that is still operational in our culture. It underlies our founding here in America. It is in our earliest documents. It is alluded to. This idea of human dignity, this sacred space of personhood from which the free exercise of conscience and right reason and other rights that we tend to take for granted, such as religious freedom, flow.

Human dignity, the two words that mark the 21st century architecture for how we ought to conduct international affairs, reaching toward authentic relationships and dialogue with people with whom we may have had tremendous misunderstandings in the past, tremendous tensions, or even the grave consequences of war.

Again, as I mentioned earlier, Madam Speaker, the tech gap is closing. We can beat anybody anywhere. We can do that and will continue to be able to do that. And, again, a strong military is absolutely essential to keeping the peace and creating the conditions for stability internationally, which protects us here at home.

But what happens when, again, the miniaturization of technology is such that any bad actor or any bad nation has ready access to it; we have to ask ourselves: And then what?

It is this idea of being in authentic dialogue around this fundamental prin-

ciple that is operative in the way in which we conduct our affairs; human dignity, mutual respect for that sacred space of the person and their perspectives and their ability to use reason to think for what is good for themselves, their family, and their country.

Human dignity. This is manifesting itself very clearly in something that, again, is really overlooked in our dialogue because we are caught in the urgency of the moment.

Let me point this out, Madam Speaker. It is about the country of Iraq. America has given so much. We have lost so much in Iraq that it is hard to understand why engagement is ongoing and necessary. The thought of it is exhausting to the American people. It is exhausting to our process.

But I need to point this out. Much is at stake. Iraq once had a mosaic and an ancient tapestry of religious pluralism that existed there. Christians used to total 1.5 million; now only a few hundred thousand remain.

The Yazidi community, another ancient faith tradition that lived in peace, in persecution off and on; but, in attempting to live out their faith tradition in northern Iraq, right now there are about 400,000 people from the Yazidi faith tradition trapped in refugee camps. They are internally displaced persons living in tent structures, distant from their northern Iraq homes, and many are children.

As of this past summer, we had a statistic—and it is hard to know where this is now, given the dynamics—that about 3,500 Yazidi women remained as slaves of ISIS.

In fact, Madam Speaker, we are still working through the logistics, but I am very proud that I reached out to Nadia Murad, who is a Nobel Peace Prize winner, who was captured by someone named Salman, the Iraqi, and held in slavery.

She came to my office, and I spoke with her and I said: I would like to hear the fullness of your story, but I recognize that is selfish on my part and that the horror and the pain and the tragedy are very real to you. So if you do not wish to say anything, I completely understand, but I would like to know more if you are willing.

And she agreed. And she told us, moment by moment about what happened to her family, about how she was captured, sold, and how she eventually escaped, with the help of a Muslim family, by the way.

I reached out to Nadia recently, and I invited her to the State of the Union. And she is going to come. We are working through it, and I am hopeful that works out. Right now she is scheduled to come, and I am proud of that.

Because it is not about me giving a speech here about human dignity—and I think Nadia would agree with me saying this—it is not even about the trauma that she went through and the need to heal. The reason that she is speaking so clearly and so courageously about the horror she went through, in

the midst of her great pain, is this singular concept right here: human dignity.

How can civilizations survive if we do not somehow rally ourselves around this fundamental principle of respecting the sacred space of personhood, of allowing people the liberty to live in peace and exercise their tradition as they see fit, to do good things for their family, to carry forward the wisdom of their tradition and ages, through their family life and the exercise of their faith.

If we give up on that principle, where do we go?

We can fight it out. We might even be able to win. But the deeper answer lies in the message that Nadia and so many others are telling us, crying out for justice and humanitarian relief and begging for a new way to think, a new way to order ourselves.

And because we have the philosophical foundation here in America, because we have been a just and generous society and we have welcomed people who have fled persecution, the world looks at us as this beautiful place of the residual, of the protection of that fundamental value that I believe every heart longs for: to be respected, to be in community, to be loved.

Now, here is what I think we ought to do. We have about 5,400 American troops in Iraq. And, with the help of international partners, we have been training Iraqi national forces and nurturing their capacity to lead and finish the work of defeating the dark, twisted horror of ISIS.

At the behest of the Vice President, I went to Iraq last summer, and the Iraqi forces that we have trained and the military told me directly they have fought and they have fought well. Again, the irony of the attack of ISIS and the genocide against Christians and Yazidis and other religious minorities and the killing of so many innocent Muslim people is that it has created a nationalism, if you will, among the Iraqi people. And they have fought hard and fought well and taken many, many casualties.

But here is the key: An additional security footprint is still required in the Nineveh Plain and Sinjar so that it is possible—these are the areas in northern Iraq proximate to Kurdistan. A new security settlement in that area would allow the return of Christians and allow the return of Yazidis to their traditional homes and to begin to rebuild.

Again, as I mentioned, in July, at the request of the Vice President, I joined Administrator Mark Green of the United States Agency for International Development and Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom Sam Brownback, former Governor of Kansas, and we went to Iraq together.

We were responding to reports that our initial efforts to help the religious minority communities were not having the intended effect.

When we stepped into the dusty alleyways and streets and villages and

campes, we gained firsthand knowledge of the broken conditions there. Our trip included intense discussions with Iraqi religious leaders, international aid workers, displaced children, U.N. personnel, as well as our military leadership.

Despite the situation's fragility, there is certain progress being made, including courageous acts of ecumenical alliance and revitalization, often with international nongovernmental organizations and faith-based entities.

My firsthand observation was this: The situation in Iraq can be summarized in three words: possibility, urgency, and security.

Multiple levels of challenge remain. Security is weak, and the prospect of permanent refugee camps is real.

If Iraq loses its minority communities, the hope for a healthy pluralism in the region will die, and a severe chain of events will occur. Iran will expand its presence. ISIS could regenerate. Out-migration will ensue, and Iraq will forever lose this extraordinary ancient tapestry of multiple faith traditions that are so vital for human dignity, mutual respect, and peace.

So, working with the administration, our government, we are expanding and accelerating our humanitarian support for those who suffered genocide, and this is all good. However, the financial assistance must be combined with the proper security settlement that ensures a just return for these beleaguered minorities to the Nineveh Plain and Sinjar.

So, Madam Speaker, this is what I have done. I am recently getting ready to reintroduce a resolution in the House of Representatives to develop a multinational security mission to integrate local Christians, Yazidis, and other minorities into the security forces of the central government of Iraq.

□ 1800

Getting this right means justice for the oppressed, stability for Iraq, and the preservations of the principles necessary for civilization itself. By doing so, we will correct a fragile security situation. The religious minorities will have special autonomy for protection of their own areas, but, again, under Central Iraqi authority, under the Iraqi flag. The mission will be international in character under the Iraqi flag. I know, right now, many other nations are very willing to join this effort, to put down a new security footprint that would stabilize permanently that area and allow people to go home.

Madam Speaker, there is another issue related critically to human dignity, and while it is not something that we often talk and think about, we are starting to get our mind around how big tech is controlling our lives. We are starting to worry that the surveillance of our habits and our contacts by people who shouldn't be surveilling us, these big tech compa-

nies, are creating multiple levels of difficulty. This growing problem here in America is affecting the most vulnerable persons here: our children.

The CEO of Google, a few months ago, recently came before Congress, and he did receive an earful. Big tech is controlling our lives. Big tech is concentrated and dominating. Big tech is going to necessarily come under increased policy scrutiny to ensure that individual privacy is protected and competition is not stifled. But one overlooked area, a problem, is protecting children online.

Now, Google's YouTube is the most popular online platform for children on Earth, and 8 out of 10 U.S. children from 6 to 12 use it daily. In April of this past year, 23 child and privacy advocacy groups filed a complaint with the Federal Trade Commission arguing that Google's YouTube online video and advertising network systematically collected data on the online habits of tens of millions of YouTube-watching children under the age of 13, and that data was sold to marketers.

Now, in support of this advocacy, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, who is from Rhode Island, who sits on the other side of the aisle from me, he and I asked Google for answers on its policy regarding protection of children online. The response was weak.

So our goal is to continue to try to ensure that the internet's extraordinarily beneficial technological advances square with the time-honored values essential to a humane, decent, and dignified world. We want Google to thoroughly answer our questions. We want Google to be true to its original motto: "Don't Be Evil."

Now, Madam Speaker, let me turn to another topic, and touch on it briefly, to talk about what is germane in this moment, given the discussions of border security, some of the things we actually worked on last year that weren't successful but, nonetheless, may provide some answers for the current dilemma that we find ourselves in.

America is, again, a kind and generous nation, and we have opened our arms to persons who seek refuge and want to rebuild their own lives and accept and embrace the deeper values of our country. However, charity cannot flow from chaos. No one is entitled to enter America illegally. Law and order create the conditions for justice and compassion. Law and order create the conditions necessary for charity, for justice, and for compassion.

Now, the dynamics around immigration are complex and multilayered. A Yale study came out last year that said the number of persons illegally in the United States could be as high as 30 million, but at least 40 percent of those have overstayed a visa. And over the past 30 years—and this is what we are wrestling with right now—over the past 30 years, incomplete border control, insufficient Federal enforcement, and the cynical exploitation of the poor for economic gain here in America

has created an attractiveness and led to a failing system.

So, in an attempt to meet multiple immigration challenges, to align the various perspectives that are here in Congress about a humane and compassionate response about the need for additional, necessary border resources, about the need to update our immigration laws, this year we voted on legislation that would stiffen internal enforcement, modernize our immigration laws, and significantly increase border resources.

The House-led legislation moved more toward a merit-based immigration system, provided new funding for more humane shelters at the border. It accelerated the judicial review process, and it made accommodations to resolve the anxious ambiguity for those who are called the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA kids, children who were brought here through no fault of their own.

I supported these initiatives, but, unfortunately, they failed in the House. And moving forward, I think we need to keep certain other priorities at the forefront of the immigration debate, which are, of course, an increase in border security, robust internal enforcement, and this additional priority which is now only coming to light. We have been doing this for a number of years. Of course, the policy needs to be revisited and evaluated in terms of success, but I do think it is an important one: moving the immigration debate off the 1-yard line and working with creative and imaginative foreign policy engagement with the countries in the Northern Triangle of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador. In that way, to help those countries build more just and humane systems both economically and politically, to create the conditions for stability, decreases the intensity of need for out-migration for either economic purposes or fleeing criminal activity.

Now, immigration can seem remote and abstract for many of us, but it is important to remember that it has a human face, and I am very proud that we are doing two things at once here. We are, of course, debating the importance of immigration policy and potential changes, but also assisting many people who have gotten tangled in immigration difficulties back home.

Madam Speaker, I think there are certain things in this House that transcend disagreement, and one of them is our veterans. Americans often sense what is right and good, and we instinctively recognize the nobility of self-sacrifice for another, for our country, and for our timeless ideals, and our veterans stand above the division and discord—beyond politics—to what is lasting and true.

But beyond our applause and admiration, we are also duty-bound in this body to keep our promise to care for them. So, this past year, we did some important things.

Back at home, we are in the process, after some long negotiations, of cre-

ating a new state-of-the-art VA facility in Lincoln, on the historic veterans' campus there. This is a victory. This is a significant victory for economic regeneration of a unique historic property, and it arrives on the heels of a very successful public-private partnership to expand and improve and innovate the Omaha VA Medical Center. I am so proud that Nebraska continues to inspire the Nation with creative partnerships to assist our veterans.

Now, here in Congress, we passed a law called the VA Maintaining Systems and Strengthening Integrated Outside Networks, the acronym is the MISSION Act. It was signed into law, and it brought the long-needed reforms in the last Congress to the VA system. It provides a replacement for the VA Choice program and consolidates community care programs for veterans who live far from a VA center or experience long wait times for care.

This is going to assist many of our veterans in rural communities and help them receive the quality of care that they deserve in a reasonable amount of time. This act also expanded the veteran caregiver program, making more pre-9/11 veterans and their families eligible for assistance.

Now, another bipartisan project that I hope we can pursue shortly, and we have been in dialogue in a bipartisan manner on this, is to work with the international community to create a historic center at the site of our D-day battles in Normandy. A new institute that is being envisioned by some European colleagues could reestablish, for the 21st century, a renewed understanding of the pivotal battle that happened on D-day, its consequences for the war, and the institutions that emerged afterward that have created the conditions for stability and prosperity, many of which are aging and need to be updated and challenged.

The United States cannot pull the world's weight alone. We need to be in authentic partnership and in authentic dialogue when we have differences, but in partnership with those who have been given the capacity by our sacrifice, both militarily and economically, to advance their own economies and build out systems of governance.

Again, the 21st century architecture of international diplomacy is going to revolve around that central idea: authentic partnerships based on the philosophical principle of human dignity that lead to burden sharing and vision sharing at the same time.

Madam Speaker, I had an interesting thing happen this summer. I wasn't at home, and I regret that I wasn't there to receive him, but he stopped in my office. World War II veteran Sidney Walton stopped by, and he has a really fascinating story.

You see, he told my staff and some of the young people there, the interns, he has a deep regret that when he was young, he never really took the time to visit with the last few remaining Civil War veterans. So he has taken it upon

himself; he has embarked on a national No Regrets Tour, and his goal is to visit all 50 States and give young Americans a chance to meet a World War II veteran.

Again, his name is Sidney Walton. We were honored to have him in Nebraska, and he will finish his tour at the White House, as I understand it, this February, on his 100th birthday.

Thank you, Sidney. Great, great effort.

Madam Speaker, let me also touch upon another area that is so essential to our well-being, our sense of being able to fulfill these deepest longings that we have, our healthy sense of ambition for ourselves and for our family.

A lot of times around here we cite economic data, have a bunch of charts that show statistics. We do a lot of that around here. It doesn't really convey, I think, the deeper dynamics of what is happening. But let me go into it just for a bit and talk about the positive outcomes that have occurred.

This year, we have seen more jobs, increased wages, and reinvestment in equipment, plants, and research and development. Our gross domestic product, one of the measures of the economy, is climbing, and median household income is rising. Unemployment is at a 50-year low, and many people who have been marginalized or on the sidelines, thankfully, have found access to meaningful work.

And if we think about a holistic approach to helping our neighbor, work is dignity. When a person is able to use their gifts and talents, either their two hands or their intellect, to make things, they are not only providing for their own well-being, but they are in solidarity with the community. This benefit of exchange goes beyond just material. It creates the value of relationships. That is the beauty and dignity of work.

And when people are sidelined, when entire communities have been decimated through poor planning or poor policies or become overdependent upon one industry that decides it is going to pick up and leave—and we have seen that happen over and over in America—it is not fair to people; it is not fair to communities.

But when we can see a return of entrepreneurial momentum, especially in small business—and again, people who have had real difficulty, for whatever reason, finding access to meaningful work restores individuals' vitality, of course, helps them to help themselves and creates solidarity and community. That is what, when we go into all these charts and graphs and economic figures, we really ought to be talking about, what I just said: the dignity and beauty and meaning of work, the gift of work, the ability to create the conditions necessary for societal flourishing.

□ 1815

So last year, we passed an important, what was called Tax Cuts and Jobs Act,

and we are seeing this enhanced economic growth and more take-home pay for families.

In addition to those important benefits, there is another little-known provision in here that I want to touch on for a moment, and it is called Opportunity Zones. It provides powerful tax incentives to encourage revitalization of some of the newest, most economically distressed areas of the country. It has been overlooked in terms of our understanding of that law.

This investment opportunity will foster job regeneration and make better use of taxpayer dollars already spent, and it forges stronger communities.

Madam Speaker, I used to be on our city council back home, and most of city council works is public works. When you see an area that is no longer functioning well, it is not just a blight on the community; it is not just that buildings are run down. We already made an investment there. We already paid for streets. We already paid for streetlights. We already paid for utilities, and they are being underutilized. That minimizes the return on an investment already made.

We also have to provide police and fire protection for these areas. Again, those are real costs to the taxpayer. They are not on an accounting balance sheet, but they are real costs. It is called opportunity cost and underutilized investment. It is already there.

So this idea of regenerating places across America that have the infrastructure already creates the conditions in which we get a better return on the tax dollar for money already spent. We are not chewing up additional land and resources. We are recycling, regenerating, rethinking possibility in some of the hardest hit areas of our country.

I am excited. In my own congressional district, there are 14 of these Opportunity Zones that have been designated.

Now, here are some hard realities, and I should point them out because they are real. Let's just be honest.

Our deficit is high, and it is stubbornly high, and there are real disparities between those at the top and those who struggle to make a living.

And while we hear policymakers tend to take too much credit for economic booms and too little blame for the crashes, most analysts do conclude that the actions taken by Congress over the last year have improved our economic outlook—again, a good accomplishment.

We got the farm bill done. We got the right type of tax reform done. We strengthened our military, and we are looking forward to the debates around where we go as a nation now.

Something that continues to be difficult for all of us, though, is the right type of healthcare reform. And I am going to venture out here and say that I would assume that everybody in this body holds to these same three principles. I don't mean to speak for any-

one else, but this is what I believe. I think we ought to be striving for three things in the right type of healthcare reform: lower cost, improved well-being, and the protection of vulnerable persons.

So let's just start there. Let's not create another proxy fight over the Affordable Care Act. Let's just start there.

How do we get to lower cost, particularly for people in rural communities who are priced out of the individual market and have incomes that they don't get a subsidy?

Some of the farmers in my community are paying as high as \$40,000 for healthcare. You can't do it unless you are very wealthy.

So what happens? A member of the family has to leave and go get a job in order to get the benefit. We don't even know how to calculate the economic lost potential of forcing somebody to go do a job they don't want to do simply to get health insurance. We don't even know how to calculate that.

So I proposed something in the farm bill. Unfortunately, the Senate didn't take it up, but it is the Rural Health Insurance Act, which would have subsidized the startup of new risk pools to provide for better health insurance options in areas of rural communities, primarily, where this market has been decimated, where people have had to change the way they reorder their economic lives in order to have some access to health insurance. I thought it was a good idea.

The startup costs for risk pool sharing, the sharing burden that is necessary to create an insurance product for smaller businesses, are high, so I wanted to provide, just like we do in markets that don't function efficiently, like crop insurance, a subsidy that would help the startup of these new risk pools in order to give more competition to the health insurance market in rural communities. That is one idea I had. We didn't get it all the way through, but I am glad it passed the House.

I look forward to working with colleagues on the other side of the aisle again who are looking toward those three goals. How do we think creatively and imaginatively about reducing costs, improving well-being?

We are right around the corner from amazing breakthroughs in innovation and technology in both managing and preventing and curing disease, and we have significantly increased our funding on a bipartisan basis for the National Institutes of Health for disease research.

So we have done a number of things that are important for the American people. Of course, it tends to get overshadowed by some of the more philosophical fights that have occurred, but I would ask my colleagues, let's embrace the concept that we might be able to find some policies that everybody could potentially agree on around three goals: reducing cost, improving

well-being, and protecting vulnerable persons. I think that is pretty reasonable.

There is another idea out there that I will be introducing this year. I already have a cosponsor from the other side of the aisle. Here is the problem:

For 3 years in a row now, America's life expectancy has declined. We are consuming more healthcare and dying younger. Rates of asthma and diabetes have skyrocketed in some populations, and it is really hard to see whether or not we are making progress on certain preventable illnesses. We can do better than that. That is not a necessary condition that we have to settle on.

So, to start an effective new conversation, I am introducing the Community Health Improvement Leadership and Development Act. It is called the CHILDA Act. My cosponsor is from a large urban area, and this allows communities across America to fully participate in improving their own health.

How does it work? When community members find an innovative way to improve health and save money in their State Medicaid program, the legislation allows the verified savings to be shared back to that very community and State. It is a virtual cycle of assuring access to care and more creative prevention. I like it. It is a win-win for taxpayers and people in communities and towns across Nebraska and America.

As we go on, I hope this is one of those ideas that fits into the three sets of principles as to how we are going to reduce cost, improve outcomes, and protect vulnerable persons.

Madam Speaker, I know our time is getting ready to run short, and can you give me an idea of how much time is left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I want to introduce a new topic in the time that we have remaining, again speaking to that which might be able to unite us in a very divided time, that which is a fundamental principle that is operative in most of our hearts, that which, again, transcends these temporary and urgent moments of policy division. It is what I call natural security.

We talked about national security. We talked about economic security. We talked about human dignity, family security. Now I want to talk about natural security, and here is an example.

Nebraska is one of the only States where you can find three distinct subspecies of the turkey.

Madam Speaker, are you with me on this? It is really very fascinating.

In the southeast corner of Nebraska, you can find the Eastern turkey. In the southwest corner, you can see a Rio, and out west, you can find a Merriam. This unique trifecta exists right there in my home.

Now, why am I raising this? Why would you be raising this? Of course, I

find it interesting, and I hope you do as well, Madam Speaker.

This newfound abundance of turkeys is an amazing story because, due to urban pressures and habitat loss and improperly regulated hunting, not too long ago, wild turkeys were in decline across the Nation. But they have since rebounded through basic conservation efforts.

With innovative thinking and proactive policy, we can conserve and restore other wildlife and natural habitats, while bringing social, cultural, and economic multipliers to our rural communities.

Nebraska has been at the forefront of such conservation efforts, and we will continue to lead this charge at home as well as here, so I have introduced the Recovering America's Wildlife Act.

Now, Madam Speaker, we weren't able to get it through Congress last year, but I think by the end of the session, we had 120—it was probably a little bit higher—bipartisan cosponsors.

So what does it do? It takes an upstream approach to habitat protection through robust funding of State wildlife action plans so that we don't have the downstream effect of habitat loss. In Nebraska, we do this through means of voluntary landowner agreements.

This is why this is important. As we approach the renewal of the Endangered Species Act, RAWA, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act, actually gets in front of the problem by preventing wildlife from becoming endangered in the first place, and it moves us from costly regulation and litigation to collaboration.

I am very excited about this because I think it is another way in which we can use moneys from lands in Federal trust and plow it back into another form of trust that creates a widespread benefit for those interested in environmental policy, those interested in conservation policy, and those interested in enhanced recreational sporting and hunting opportunity.

That is why so many people have gotten on this bill. It transcends our divide. It is a creative mechanism by which we use certain moneys that are already being gathered into the Treasury and apply them in innovative and creative ways.

Madam Speaker, I, again, am grateful for the opportunity to have had time to present to this body an overview of last year's work. It is important because, ultimately, it is not just about policy; it is about persons.

A woman named Mary came into my office this past year, and she was with two men who had made their living as truckers. Their pensions were in danger. Mary just began to tear up as she explained the dire circumstances in which they found themselves, because multiemployer pension plans—this is a little bit in the weeds, but multiemployer pension plans, some are in dire condition.

So what does that mean? Somebody who said, "I am going to work for this

set of benefits and, in turn, I am going to be guaranteed an income of this level in my older years," all of that promise, all that work and those promises are now under real threat.

So, again, working in a bipartisan fashion, that is an area which is in severe need that we worked to try to fix last year and will do so again, working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, my intention tonight was to give an overview of the last year because so often, again, in the dynamics of the moment, we lose sight of the good things that were accomplished for our economic security, for our national security, for family security, for the well-being of our land and water. By taking a little bit of a look back, maybe this gives us some prospect for unity, consensus, while fighting on principle, but unity and consensus for good.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 10, 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:

17. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-518, "Bruce Robey Court Designation Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

18. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-533, "Clarification of Hospital Closure Procedure Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

19. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-546, "Revised Transfer of Jurisdiction over U.S. Reservation 724 (Lots 896 and 897 within Square 620) and Extinguishment of Covenants Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

20. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-532, "Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

21. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-519, "Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

22. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C.

Act 22-545, "Relocation of a Passageway Easement in Square 696 Authorization Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

23. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-544, "Approval of the Starpower Communications Open Video System Franchise Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

24. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-503, "Revised Synthetics Abatement and Full Enforcement Drug Control Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

25. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-542, "Parcel 42 Surplus Property Declaration and Disposition Approval Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

26. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-541, "Boxing and Wrestling Commission Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

27. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-502, "Parent-led Play Cooperative Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

28. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-540, "Vulnerable Population and Employer Protection Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

29. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-547, "Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Clarification Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

30. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-499, "Access to Public Benefits Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

31. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-517, "Service Contract Regulation Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

32. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-516, "Teachers, Police, and Firefighters Retirement Benefits Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

33. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-515, "Trafficking Survivors Relief Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

34. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-505, "At-Risk Tenant Protection Clarifying Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

35. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-478, "Neighborhood Safety and Engagement Fund Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

36. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-514, "Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

37. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-513, "Save Good Food Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

38. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-504, "Elections Modernization Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

39. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-511, "Ensuring Community Access to Recreational Spaces Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

40. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-508, "Extension of Time to Dispose of 8th & O Streets, N.W., Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

41. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-501, "Rental Housing Affordability Re-establishment Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

42. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-500, "Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Debit Cards Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

43. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-507, "Rebate Reform Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

44. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-506, "Access to Treatment for Anaphylaxis Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

45. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-492, "Rental Housing Commission Independence Clarification Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

46. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-539, "Daytime School Parking Zone Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

47. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-538, "Leaf Blower 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.

48. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-537, "Omnibus Department of For-

Hire Vehicles Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

49. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-536, "Vacancy Increase Reform Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

50. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-535, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 653, S.O. 15-26384, Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

51. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-534, "Salary Adjustment Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

52. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-512, "Pathways to District Government Careers Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 356. A bill to establish the Medgar Evers Home National Monument in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 357. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 358. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a California New River restoration program to build on, and help coordinate funding for, restoration and protection efforts relating to the New River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on 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. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 359. A bill to provide for certain programs and developments in the Department of Energy concerning the cybersecurity and vulnerabilities of, and physical threats to, the electric grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 360. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to test the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 361. A bill to impose terrorism-related sanctions with respect to As-Saib Ahl Al-Haq and Harakat Hizballah Al-Nujaba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 362. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act with respect to functions assigned to Assistant Secretaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 363. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to authorize assignment to States of Federal agency environmental review responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 364. A bill to provide for additional security requirements for Syrian and Iraqi refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 365. A bill to prohibit the construction of new border barriers, including walls or fences, on certain Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Ms. CLARKE

of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 366. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to eliminate cost sharing with respect to coverage of insulin as a covered part D drug under the Medicare program or as a covered outpatient drug under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 367. A bill making appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations Act expires before the enactment of a new appropriations Act; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the

Committee on 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. CONAWAY:

H.R. 368. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the George W. Bush Childhood Home, located at 1412 West Ohio Avenue, Midland, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. PALMER, Mr. JONES, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BOST, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ESTES, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. WALKER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BARR, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRADY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 369. A bill to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 370. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a program relating to physical security and cybersecurity for pipelines and liquefied natural gas facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 371. A bill making appropriations for certain Federal employees working during the Government shutdown beginning on or about December 22, 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VELA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEYER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 372. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the eligibility of Transportation Security Administration employees to receive public safety officers' death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 373. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain administrative or judicial review respecting the identification of primary care practitioners under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 374. A bill to make continuing appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event that appropriations for Coast Guard pay in fiscal year 2019 expire and a new appropriations Act has not been enacted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COLE (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 375. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 376. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H.R. 377. A bill to establish new ZIP codes for certain communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 378. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require voting systems used in elections for Federal office to produce a voter-verified, auditable paper record of the votes cast in such elections, to require State election officials to audit the results of such elections prior to certifying the results, to provide grants to States to improve voting system security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself and Mr. GIANFORTE):

H.R. 379. A bill to limit the authority of a State to require remote sellers to collect taxes and fees owed by purchasers then located in such State incident to their purchases of goods and services from such sellers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 380. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require the consideration of invasive species when prescribing fishways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 381. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of General Services to modernize terms in certain regulations; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 382. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Custer County Airport, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 383. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to ensure that preexisting condition exclusions with respect to enrollment in health insurance coverage and group health plans continue to be prohibited; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 384. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase the penalties applicable to aliens who unlawfully reenter the United States after being removed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BACON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 385. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 386. A bill to update the map of, and modify the maximum acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 387. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 388. A bill to update thresholds for certain currency transaction reports and suspicious activity reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 389. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay rewards under an asset recovery rewards program to help identify and recover stolen assets linked to foreign government corruption and the proceeds of such corruption hidden behind complex financial structures in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 390. A bill to establish the Adams Memorial Commission to carry out the provisions of Public Law 107-62, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 391. A bill to provide transparency regarding waivers granted to individuals from the ethics requirements of Executive Order 13770 or any subsequent similar order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 392. A bill to require the disclosure of beneficial ownership by a foreign person of aircraft registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

H.R. 393. A bill to require the disclosure of beneficial ownership by a foreign person of aircraft registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 394. A bill to protect, improve, and modernize the act of voting; to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COLE, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 395. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require agencies to respond to comments from congressional committees about proposed rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 396. A bill to provide for the equitable settlement of certain Indian land disputes regarding land in Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. KATKO, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 398. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot competitive grant program for the development of a skilled energy workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 399. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to support the development of pre-apprenticeship programs in the building and construction trades that serve underrepresented populations, including individuals from low income and rural census tracts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 400. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to direct the Postal Regulatory Commission to promulgate regulations to establish rates of postage for packages shipped by priority mail from the United States to a foreign Army Post Office, Fleet Post Office, or Diplomatic Post Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 401. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release reversionary and re-

served interests in certain lands within the Coconino National Forest, Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 402. A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by Win Oil Company, Incorporated, for purposes of economic development by removing the Federal reversion interest in that land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 403. A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 404. A bill to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of outlying areas of the United States to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 405. A bill to permit the District of Columbia and each of the territories of the United States to provide and furnish statues honoring their citizens for placement in Statuary Hall in the same manner as statues honoring citizens of the States are provided for placement in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 406. A bill to amend title 1, United States Code, to provide for a definition of the term "State" and to include territories therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 407. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish the Virgin Islands visa waiver program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 408. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress regarding the pension system of the United States Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the cover over of distilled spirits taxes to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide reimbursement for possessions of the United States with respect to the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the source rules to provide for economic recovery in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the residence and source rules to provide for economic recovery in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the work opportunity credit to small businesses which hire individuals who are members of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 414. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include algal blooms in the

definition of a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 415. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to States and local governments easements and rights-of-way over Federal land within Gateway National Recreation Area for construction, operation, and maintenance of projects for control and prevention of flooding and shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 416. A bill to amend section 524(c) of title 18, United States Code, to use lawfully forfeited drug seizures to increase border security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 417. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish measures to combat invasive lionfish, 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 Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 418. A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 419. A bill to make continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 420. A bill to provide for the regulation of marijuana products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILD (for herself, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JONES, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 421. A bill making continuing appropriations for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 422. A bill to prevent catastrophic failure or shutdown of remote diesel power engines due to emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens sixteen years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding Presidential election voting rights for residents of all United States territories and commonwealths; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 31. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H. Res. 32. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COOK, Mr. MAST, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LOEBESACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 33. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H. Res. 34. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first Saturday in October as "National Animal Rescue Day" to create awareness of the importance of adoption and to educate on the importance of spaying and neutering animals and the encouragement of animal adoptions throughout the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. BROWNLEY of California introduced a bill (H.R. 423) for the relief of Robert Feiss; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 358.

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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

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.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution—Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . .";

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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 370.

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 the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 & 9

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order the enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, of clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to the general Welfare of the United States).

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Const. Art. I, §8.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 383.

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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause i8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 390.

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, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution states: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article Section I, Section 8

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following :

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Article IV; Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I and Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. WILD:

H.R. 421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 & Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

"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."

"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State." [Page H2793]

Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.J. Res. 23.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.J. Res. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 1: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CARSON of

Indiana, Mr. BERA, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 8: Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CROW, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WILD, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MENG, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. VELA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TRONE, Ms. PORTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 25: Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

H.R. 38: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 51: Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PORTER, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 66: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 95: Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COOK, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SIREs, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JONES, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KEATING,

Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MAST, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARR, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 96: Mr. SOTO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 113: Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 115: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 138: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 140: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 141: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COMER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 197: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 205: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 211: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 216: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 218: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 219: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. FOX of North Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ESTES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 220: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 221: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BOST, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KIND, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 230: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 242: Ms. HAALAND and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 249: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 250: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 270: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 296: Mr. BARR, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 299: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 301: Mr. BACON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 305: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 318: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 337: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 339: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 342: Mr. CLOUD.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. POCAN.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. HECK, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019

No. 4

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O God, the might of them that put their trust in You, save us from the fatal folly of relying upon our strength alone.

Help our lawmakers to remember that You are the only sure refuge and You desire to do for us more than we can ask or imagine. Give our Senators the courage to seek Your truth and the humility to walk in the light You provide. May their labors contribute to America's strength and influence in our world as You use them to lift aloft the light of freedom. As our legislators labor for Your glory, may they know that they are part of Your ultimate plan for our Nation and world.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 47

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 the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 47) to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last night, President Trump delivered his first address to the Nation from the Oval Office. In the midst of this partial government shutdown, the President offered a reminder of just what is at stake; that is, the security of our Nation's southern border.

By now, on day 19 of Senate Democrats' latest experiment in "absentee negotiation," my colleagues are well-versed in the facts on the ground.

We know Border Patrol agents are encountering historic levels of illicit substances like fentanyl and heroin at our border. We know that last year saw thousands of attempted border crossings by individuals with criminal records and literally hundreds more by known gang members. We understand the status quo is not enough to keep our families and communities safe.

Fortunately, we know the solutions on the table—solutions which the President has placed at the center of the national conversation since the earliest days of his administration—are actually eminently reasonable.

As one former Border Patrol Chief's under President Obama put it just recently, "If you look in the past, you don't have to go too far back into history . . . bipartisan legislation passed where they built the wall, or fence, or physical barrier, or whatever you want to call it. It's a wall. It works."

That is what the Border Patrol Chief under President Obama said.

He went on to say:

It is not based on personal political ideology. That's based on historical data and facts that could be proven. . . . I cannot think of a legitimate argument why anyone would not support the wall as part of the multi-layered border security issue.

So why are we not listening to the experts and the people who are doing this every day, like that Border Patrol Chief under President Obama?

The experts know what they are talking about. The facts back them up. According to CBP, in four border sectors where this administration has already constructed or improved physical barriers in the last 2 years—listen to this—illicit traffic has fallen by 90 percent—90 percent.

Of course, not too long ago, my colleagues across the aisle had a completely different position on this subject. Before the political winds blew a different way, before this particular President was inaugurated, Senate Democrats did heed the advice of the men and women who protect our border.

By very wide bipartisan margins, and on multiple occasions, the Senate has cleared literally billions of dollars in funding for physical barriers along the southern border.

In 2006, then-Senator Obama said the Secure Fence Act would provide "badly needed funding for better fences and better security." That is what then-Senator Obama said in 2006.

In 2009, the current Democratic leader praised as major progress "630 miles of border fence"—fence—"that create a significant barrier to illegal immigration." That is what the then-majority leader said in 2009, who is now the minority leader.

During the last Presidential election, former Senator Clinton saw fit to tout the "numerous times" she voted to "build a barrier to try and prevent illegal immigrants from coming in." That is what Hillary Clinton said. "Numerous times," "significant barrier,"

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S77

“badly needed,” that was where leading Democrats stood.

Today, however, it seems there is a new party line. The use of physical barriers to preserve the integrity of a sovereign Nation is now, according to the new Speaker of the House, “immoral”—“immoral.” They went from “badly needed” to “immoral” in little more than the span of a Presidency. Talk about a pivot. Talk about a pivot.

My Democratic friends wanted fencing and physical barriers in the recent past. Their most prominent leaders actually bragged about voting for physical barriers. The only thing that has changed between then and now is the occupant of the White House.

Steel fencing was fine, even salutary, when President Obama was in the White House, but it is “immoral” when President Trump occupies the office.

All of a sudden—all of a sudden—Democrats have developed this new partisan allergy to the subject of border security. They are even prolonging a partial government shutdown just to avoid getting more of what they themselves have voted for in the past.

This inconsistency doesn’t stop with drawing imaginary lines in the sand between the border security the Democrats once supported and the virtually identical measures they have decided to oppose today. The inconsistency also extends to the conduct of the Senate itself during this tantrum.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday evening, Democrats blocked the Senate from proceeding to important foreign policy legislation. This bill, which was blocked last night, included measures of which they have been outspokenly supportive and even cosponsored, but then they decided that getting anything done at all this week would clash with their new political brand.

To be clear, the legislation I am referring to would have addressed several serious challenges to U.S. interests in the Middle East. It would have reaffirmed our commitment to the security of Israel, our closest regional ally. It would have reauthorized defense cooperation with Jordan, a critical partner, and it would have taken a vital step toward bringing the perpetrators and the enablers of the Assad regime atrocities in Syria to justice. Frankly, it would have delivered on promises to which my Democratic colleagues appeared to be firmly committed.

In their own words, Senate Democrats have discussed “the continuation of America’s unshakeable, seven-decade commitment to Israel’s security” and doing “everything in our power to fight the BDS movement,” but, alas, instead of proceeding to this legislation, Senate Democrats voted to block it.

My friend the Democratic leader chose to take this partial government shutdown that he is prolonging and add

his very own Senate shutdown on top of it. They want to shut down the Senate as well—no progress, no bipartisan work, not even on urgent and pressing matters, nothing that might take the spotlight off his unreasonable show-down with the President.

Just as an example, during the 2013 government shutdown, the Senate kept right on chugging through the people’s business. We passed 5 bills, 13 resolutions, appointed conferees on the farm bill, the budget resolution, and confirmed 28 of President Obama’s nominees. The Senate was not shut down during the last government shutdown. This time, the Democrats want to hold everything hostage—everything?

Here is more inconsistency. Senate Democrats were for border security, including billions for physical barriers, before they were against it, and they were for the Senate working hard during government shutdowns on other business before they were against it.

Until our Democratic colleagues agree to get back to work—until they agree to get back to work—the Senate can’t make much progress. Rest assured, Assad has not pressed the pause button on the Syrian civil war simply because it doesn’t suit the Democratic leader’s political strategy this week, Israel’s enemies haven’t stopped either, and until Democrats prioritize the public interest ahead of political spite, our border will not be secured, and the Federal Government will remain partially closed.

I cannot urge my Democratic colleagues more strongly to get past this purely partisan spite, rediscover their own past positions on border security, and negotiate a fair solution with the President to secure our Nation and reopen all of the Federal Government.

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, last night President Trump tried to convince Congress and the American people that there is a crisis at our southern border. It was little more than a rehash of spurious arguments and misleading statistics the President has been using for weeks. President Trump once again tried to claim there was a crisis at the border. The fact is, migrant border crossings have been declining for nearly two decades.

The President inveighed against drugs pouring over the border, but the

vast majority of heroin enters the United States through legal ports of entry in trucks and on airplanes.

The President and his allies have been claiming that nearly 4,000 known or suspected terrorists have been stopped from entering the United States. They say that is a reason for the border wall. But nearly every single one of those apprehensions occurred in airports, not on our southern border.

In a recent report, Donald Trump’s State Department concluded that there is no credible evidence that terrorist groups were trying to enter the United States through the southern border. In a report on the President’s strategy to combat terrorist travel, sent to Congress by President Trump on December 21—the day the shutdown began—the National Security Council, appointed by President Trump, did not even mention a wall or a barrier to stop terrorists from entering the country.

The President continues to fearmonger, and he makes up the facts. This is a Presidency that is in crisis. It has so many problems, and it is the old trick—fearmonger, distort, try to scare people, and maybe they will not pay attention to the real problems in this administration.

In no way, however—the President is not getting his way. His fearmongering just isn’t working. In no way did the President’s speech last night make a persuasive or even a new case for an exorbitantly expensive border wall—a wall that the President guaranteed would be paid by Mexico. He said: I ran on this. Yes, he ran on it, saying Mexico would pay for it. At his rallies, he chanted: Who will pay for the wall? The people screamed back: Mexico.

The President’s speech did nothing—nothing—to convince us here in Congress, and I believe it did nothing—nothing—to convince a skeptical public that this government shutdown is anything but a manufactured crisis of the President’s own making. The President’s speech, if anything, moved the American people even further away from his view that he should keep the government shut down until he gets his way. Reports say that the President didn’t want to give this speech. Well, he was right. I don’t think it helped his cause, and he probably hurt himself.

It is time for the President and our Republican colleagues to stop this fearmongering and to stop this diversion away from the problems that the President really has and end the shutdown. The shutdown is hurting millions of Americans, and it is going to get worse, all because of President Trump’s temper tantrum. We should not—we should not—treat hundreds of thousands of Americans—millions of Americans—as leverage to try and get something by pounding the table. That is not how our government works.

What is happening? Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers—innocent Federal workers who do their jobs, who work hard, and sometimes they get up on Monday morning with a 100-

degree fever, but they go to work because they know their job is important—have been furloughed because of what Trump has done. Four hundred thousand continue to work without pay. TSA agents, food safety inspectors, border agents—those hard-working, dedicated public servants—are about to miss a paycheck.

Last night, many of my colleagues—including Senators WARNER, KAINE, KING, CARDIN, CASEY, VAN HOLLEN, and others—held the floor to give voice to these Federal employees who live and work in their States, many of whom are living paycheck to paycheck.

President Trump's government shutdown—his choosing, he is the only one who did it—is forcing a personal crisis on those public servants and their families. How unfair, how mean-spirited, and how wrong.

These families are owed a paycheck, but they are left to wonder how they are going to pay the mortgage or the rent and all of their other bills. They are wondering what will happen to the good credit they have worked so hard to maintain over the years. They are innocent victims of the Trump shutdown—a shutdown he said 25 times he would cause, a shutdown he said he would be proud to own.

President Trump, are you proud to own a shutdown that is hurting so many innocent people? Did you realize that when you caused this?

As government agencies remain shut down, American farmers and small businesses can't get the loans they desperately need. Tourism suffers as our national parks go neglected. Some families can't get a mortgage to buy a new home. The American people are suffering needlessly—needlessly—because President Trump selfishly refuses to retreat from an intransigent, indefensible, and increasingly unpopular position.

The Democratic House has passed legislation that received support from many of my Republican colleagues to reopen the government. In no way does that legislation preclude us from having a debate and hashing out compromise solutions on border security. We have done that before.

We can continue to debate because, indeed, Democrats, Republicans, and the President all want stronger border security; we just sharply disagree about the best way of achieving it.

Why not open the government while we continue to hash out our differences? I have asked that of President Trump. I said: Give me one good reason why the shutdown should continue as we debate our differences on border security, which we all want. He could not give a single reason. We know the reason: He is leveraging—mercilessly leveraging—millions of Americans who are caught in his irresponsible action and who are hurt by it.

Let us open the government and continue to hash out our differences. That would be the responsible thing to do,

and I believe Republican Senators, many of them, know that.

I urge my friend Leader MCCONNELL to act now, convince the President to accept legislation to reopen the government, and let's pass it here on the floor of the Senate. The vast majority of the Republican caucus has already supported it. What are we waiting for?

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROD ROSENSTEIN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter, this morning it was reported that Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein intends to step down from his post at the Justice Department if the nominee for Attorney General, William Barr, is confirmed. It is a timely reminder of the swirling conflicts of interest and bias that surround nearly every Trump nominee to lead the Justice Department.

Acting Attorney General Whitaker publicly and forcefully advocated for defending and imposing severe limits on the special counsel's investigation, calling it "a mere witch hunt." He has troubling conflicts of interest, including with a grand jury witness in the investigation, not to mention the fact that he appears to have been involved in fraudulent business dealings before joining the Justice Department.

The nominee to take his place, William Barr, is just as fatally conflicted a nominee when it comes to the special counsel. Last month, we learned that Mr. Barr sent the Justice Department an unsolicited memo, criticizing the special counsel's investigation.

Mr. Rosenstein's potential departure only heightens the stakes for Mr. Barr's nomination. From all accounts, Mr. Rosenstein has been an impartial actor at the head of the special counsel's investigation. President Trump is trying to replace folks like Mr. Rosenstein with conflicted loyalists like Matthew Whitaker and William Barr. The Senate, starting with the Judiciary Committee, should subject Mr. Barr's views to the strictest of scrutiny next week. I still believe, after the revelations about Mr. Barr's unsolicited memo, President Trump ought to withdraw this nomination.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will re-

sume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1, which the clerk will now report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. THUNE. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, I think it is important that we remind ourselves about what it takes to make a law here in Washington, DC. It obviously takes passage of a bill by the House of Representatives, passage by the Senate, and a Presidential signature. Obviously, we are in the middle of sort of a, I guess you could say, fight right now between the executive branch—the President—and Democrats in the House and the Senate, which normally would be resolved by the two sides sitting down and negotiating and coming to some sort of an agreement or compromise. That, frankly, is what is going to be necessary to resolve the current crisis we are in.

The Democrats in the Congress have the majority in the House. It takes 60 votes, as we know, to do anything in the Senate, which means it will take somewhere around the order of 10 Senate Democrats in order to put a piece of legislation on the President's desk.

There has to be a negotiation. There have to be two sides at the table. The Democrats have made it very clear in the Senate and in the House that they have no interest in negotiating with the President.

Furthermore, they have determined that they are going to shut down all the rest of the business that is being done in the Senate simply because they do not want to provide funding for the border wall that has been requested by the President. That is the standoff we are currently in the middle of.

I will remind our colleagues that as recently as last month, my friend the Democratic leader said that in order for us to proceed and vote on anything in either Chamber, we need to have a piece of legislation that the President has said he would agree to sign, which, again, suggests the way out of this is for the Democrats to come to the table and enter into a negotiation with the President about how to fund the border wall, how to deal with the issue of border security, and then to open up the government. That is the way this ultimately gets resolved.

It seems to me, at least from my observation so far, that there has been no movement, zero movement—zero movement—on the part of the Democrats when it comes to trying to resolve the current situation.

I will simply say that I agree with what the Democratic leader said as recently as December; that is, in order for either Chamber—the House or the Senate—to vote on a compromise piece of legislation, it needs to be a piece of legislation that the President of the United States has said he will sign.

Each of these elements has to come together, and, obviously, each is very relevant in this conversation. You cannot have a law without a Presidential signature. There are 535 Members of Congress. There is only one President of the United States, only one person who can sign a bill into law. Obviously, the President is a critical player in this conversation.

Of course, the Democrats, as I said, have the majority in the House of Representatives. It takes 60 votes to do anything in the Senate. I think we have a majority of Senators who would vote today to provide the funding that is necessary to secure our borders, the funding that the President has requested, but it is going to take a number of Democrats, perhaps as many as 7 to 10 Democrats, in order for us to pass a bill in the Senate.

The Democrats are very relevant in this conversation. They are not irrelevant. They have to be at the table. Normally a negotiation starts with the two sides saying “This is where I am, and this is where I am” and figuring out how to reach that common ground, how to reach that middle and structure an agreement that could pass both the House and the Senate and receive a Presidential signature.

That is not what is happening right now. I think we all know that. I think it is very clear that the Democrats are very dug in; they have not moved a single inch off of their position from the time that this whole shutdown started. I think there is a path forward. I am hopeful that negotiations, discussions that will continue later today at the White House, will lead us to a conclusion, to an outcome, and to a result that gets Federal employees back to work, making sure the government continues to function and run but also addressing a critical and important priority for all of us as policymakers; that is, ensuring that we secure our border in a way to protect the American people.

I think it should go without saying that border security is a basic national security requirement. Countries have to secure their borders. They need to know who is coming into their country, and they need to be able to keep people who shouldn't be entering the country, such as criminals and drug traffickers, out. Making sure that our borders are secure is one of our most essential responsibilities of Members of Congress. It is a basic obligation, like

making sure our military is capable of defending our country. While border security is always a national security imperative, it is particularly important right now because we have not only a security but a humanitarian crisis at our border.

Over the past year, illegal border crossing apprehensions have shot up by more than 30 percent. An average of 60,000 individuals try to cross our southern border illegally each month. This represents a serious security concern. Among those trying to cross our southern border are drug dealers, gang members, human traffickers, and other criminals.

This flood of attempted border crossings also represents a serious humanitarian concern. Individuals attempting the journey to come here illegally are vulnerable to exploitation, illness, and abuse. One out of every three women attempting the journey to the United States is sexually assaulted. A staggering 70 percent of individuals become victims of violence along the way. Illness and other medical issues are serious problems. Fifty migrants a day are referred for medical care, and Customs and Border Protection rescues 4,300 people in distress every single year.

There is a direct way to stem this crisis, and that is to promote legal immigration and discourage people from coming here illegally. How do we discourage people from attempting to come here illegally? Well, I would argue we enforce our immigration laws and prevent individuals from illegally crossing our borders.

I have mentioned the dangerous individuals who can sneak across our porous borders and the humanitarian crisis we face, but of course there are even more dangers posed by the weaknesses in our border, both around barriers and through our ports of entry, such as the illegal drugs that are pouring into the country.

Every week in this country, 300 Americans die from heroin. Ninety percent of the heroin supply—90 percent—flows across our southern border. In 2017, opioids were involved in the deaths of almost 50,000 Americans. Roughly half or more of those deaths involved fentanyl, and a lot of that fentanyl is coming across our borders illegally. Federal agents have seen a 115-percent increase in the amount of fentanyl seized between ports of entry. One key part of addressing the opioid epidemic in our country is shutting down the flow of illegal drugs across our porous borders.

Democrats used to understand the need for border security. In 2009, the Democratic leader here in the Senate said:

Illegal immigration is wrong, plain and simple. Until the American people are convinced that we will stop future flows of illegal immigration, we will make no progress on dealing with the millions of illegal immigrants who are here now and on rationalizing our system of legal immigration. That's plain and simple and unavoidable.

That is from the Democratic leader here in the Senate in 2009.

In 2006, the Democratic leader and the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee voted for legislation to authorize a border fence. They were joined in their vote by then-Senator Biden, then-Senator Clinton, and then-Senator Obama.

In 2013, every Senate Democrat supported legislation requiring the completion of a 700-mile fence along our southern border. This legislation would have provided \$46 billion for border security and \$8 billion specifically for a physical barrier.

Nearly every Senate Democrat supported \$25 billion in border security funding just last February, and I suspect that more than one Democrat still understands that we desperately need to improve security at our borders. But the Democratic leadership refuses to play ball. More than 2 weeks into this shutdown, they are still not willing to negotiate a solution that would secure our borders and reopen the government. Democratic leaders are willing to ignore the security and humanitarian crisis at the southern border simply because they don't like this President and because they are afraid to oppose the far-left wing of their party.

We need to end this partial shutdown, and we need to reopen the government, but the only way for that to happen is for Democrats to work with Republicans and the President to provide adequate funding for border security. Once they negotiate in good faith toward a serious agreement that the President will sign, the Senate will immediately take it up so that we can end this shutdown and take needed steps to bolster security at our borders.

Border security is not some issue Republicans have somehow dreamed up. Securing our borders is a national security imperative, and both parties have a responsibility to make sure our Nation's borders are protected. I hope Democrats here in the Senate will remember their obligation to our Nation's citizens and work with the President to secure our borders and reopen our government. I would end where I started, and that is to say that in order for that to happen, there has to be an agreement. Both sides have to come to the table. The President, the House, and the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, are all relevant in this conversation because it takes all to accomplish a legislative result that will reopen our government, get Federal employees back to work, and at the same time take the important steps that are necessary to secure our border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I just note parenthetically that virtually every Republican and every Democrat in this body has voted for the bills that would open the government. Every single Democrat in this body is willing—if the Republican leader would bring

those bills back up—to vote for them, and the government would open. So I hope the Republican leader will allow the government to open. There are a lot of people who need to go back to work, and I will speak about this later today. It is going to be 10, 15 below zero in my home State at one point this week, making it more urgent that we reopen the government. We also have government contractors who would like to get back to work.

CATHOLIC CLERGY MISCONDUCT

Now let me speak about a different matter. I am going to speak as an individual more than as a Senator. My wife Marcelle and I, as Catholics, have shared the concern of many, whether Catholics or not, about the continued revelation of often gross misconduct on the part of some in the clergy and in the hierarchy of our church. We have seen this throughout the United States, including in our own State of Vermont.

I have rarely—rarely—spoken about religious issues in my capacity as a Senator, because I feel one's religion is private and certainly not political. However, I have spoken out about my concern and my dismay with what we have heard, and Marcelle shares those concerns with me.

I mention this because this past Sunday at mass at Holy Trinity Parish in the District of Columbia, we heard a sermon preached by Father Benjamin Hawley, a member of the Jesuits. When he finished his sermon, I will freely admit I wanted to stand up and applaud him. He spoke about what the church is finally doing in facing up to this, but then he spoke about how he was reacting and how one hopes we might react, what the reaction should be from the Pope straight down to every member of the clergy and every member of the laity. Except for some sermons preached by Marcelle's brother, Father Claude Pomerleau, I do not remember being so touched or affected by a sermon.

I had not met Father Hawley before, but after mass, I spoke with him, and I asked him if I could have his permission to put his sermon into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He agreed.

I ask unanimous consent that the homily by Father Benjamin Hawley, S.J., of January 6, 2019, be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

HOMILY FOR THE FEAST OF THE EPIPHANY

Today we celebrate the Feast of the Epiphany, the appearance of Jesus the Messiah to the world.

In classical Greek the word "epiphany" can refer to the appearance of dawn, as Isaiah, writing 500 years before Jesus' birth, does in our first reading: "See, darkness covers the earth, and thick clouds cover the peoples; but upon you the Lord shines, and over you appears his glory . . . Raise your eyes and look about . . ."

This appearance can intimate—Jesus' touching your heart or mine with peace in time of difficulty. Or the appearance can be

cosmic—the Prince of Peace revealed to Herod and to the magi—and to our world today.

Is it possible to see Jesus' latest epiphany in three recent events?

First, about 280 American bishops are in retreat just outside Chicago—no lay staff, no other priests. Guiding their retreat is Raniero Cantalamessa, a Capuchin priest, who is the Preacher to the Papal Household. I have heard him speak, and he is excellent.

Second, a hard-hitting eight-page letter from the Pope is guiding their prayer.

Francis asks them to reflect on "the steps you are taking to combat the culture of abuse and to deal with the crisis of credibility" (page 1).

"The church's credibility has been seriously undercut and diminished by these sins and crimes, but even more by the efforts made to deny or conceal them . . . (T)he mentality that would cover things up, far from helping to resolve conflicts, enabled them to fester and cause even greater hurt to the network of relationships that today we are called to heal and restore" (p2).

"Loss of credibility calls for a specific approach, since it cannot be regained by issuing stern decrees or by simply creating new committees or improving flow charts, as if we were in charge of a department of human resources" (p3).

Then, the Pope then takes them to task on infighting:

"The loss of credibility also raises painful questions about the way we relate to one another . . . (p3) This requires not only a new approach to management, but also a change in our mind-set, our way of prayer, our handling of power and money, our exercise of authority and our way of relating to one another and to the world around us . . . (pp3-4).

Without (a) clear and decisive focus, everything we do risks being tainted by self-referentiality, self-preservation and defensiveness, and thus doomed from the start" (p4).

"Let us try to break the vicious cycle of recrimination, undercutting and discrediting, by avoiding gossip and slander in the pursuit of a path of prayerful and contrite acceptance of our limitations and sins, and the promotion of dialogue, discussion and discernment . . ." (pp5-6).

Finally, third, the presidents of bishops conferences worldwide will meet in Rome in late February in a meeting organized by four church officials:

Blase Cupich, Cardinal-Archbishop of Chicago;

Oswald Cracias, Cardinal-Archbishop of Mumbai, India, and member of the Pope's council of cardinals;

Charles Scicluna, Archbishop of Malta and head of investigating abuses in the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith; and Jesuit Father Hans Zollner, president of the Center for the Protection of Minors at the Gregorian University, the Jesuit university in Rome.

The pope's letter seems to me right on target in tone and content. A retreat for discernment is very Ignatian, and the Vatican meeting will ensure worldwide applicability.

So, can you and I believe that Jesus' epiphany is the motive force behind the bishops' retreat, the pope's letter and February bishops meeting?

We are called by Jesus himself to be hopeful. But we are also called to be thoughtful, discerning good and evil around us. I find myself seesawing between hope and doubt, between hope and fear, between hope and no-hope, as I reflect on the good and evil. I want to have hope, but I have to admit that having hope is hard, sometimes nearly impossible.

It is true that Jesus grew up and became the Messiah. But Herod's murdering a gen-

eration of children went unpunished, as far as I know, and the historical record on mass murderers or mass abusers isn't promising.

I am grateful for what the bishops and Francis are now doing. But I keep asking myself why it takes so much external pressure to get them to do the right, decent thing that seems so obvious and not even that hard.

Some days I feel like Candide, returning from his hero's journey to cultivate his own garden. In my garden I can be hopeful. But I can't live a solitary life. And when I re-engage, I become discouraged when I find the bishops' response so slow and so begrudging.

But then I wonder about how God's justice and mercy might be made real in the next life, especially for bishops, cardinals and popes, but for us too. I imagine Purgatory not as a place of hellfire and smoke, but rather as a place where kindly but determined angels would sit, like referees in black and white stripped outfits, each one in comfortable room in front of a large flat-screen TV, each with a recently arrived soul.

In a gentle way the angel-referee would guide the deceased not through an instant replay but a slow replay of their lives, stopping the action and asking each bishop, cardinal and pope—and each one of us—to reconsider individual events in their lives, and asking questions like, What were you thinking? How did that work out—for you and for everyone else? If you had to do it again, how might you choose?

There would be no scoreboard, because God would want everyone to win, and no time clock. Everyone would have time and all eternity—with the angel-referee's prompting—to rethink what they had said and done.

And some would have a very painful time of it, because angels are messengers of God's justice. Their job is to reveal justice to the minds of souls as yet living in darkness. And the angel-referees would make the final call.

With that much time and such wise, persistent guides, most would probably make it to die podium for their trophy. Angels might have to guide a few of the obdurate to long-term parking, but such souls would have had a chance and in the end would have put themselves there.

In the meantime you and I are on the seesaw.

Jesus began his life in his mother's lap in the stable, as the great artists have shown us, but surrounded by the blood and death of children and the corruption of the Jewish king.

Jesus ended his life in his mother's lap, as Michaelangelo shows us in the Pieta, still surrounded by the blood, death and the corruption of civic and religious leaders.

My question to myself is always, Does it really have to be this hard? And the answer seems to be, No, it doesn't have to be. But, Yes, it is going to be this hard as long as people, especially people in positions of power, make self-serving choices. The blood, death and corruption are constants in human life. And yet he is the Prince of Peace and the source of our hope.

On this great Feast we can come to realize that, if you and I have to live on the seesaw, then at least we can remain anchored to hope there, because Jesus, the source of our hope, accompanied by his Blessed Mother, has the power to anchor us there in love.

So, in our Eucharist today let's share divine love and hope with one another in communion and leave here, imbued with new hope to share with our world, so the world too can find hope and peace.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, from El Paso to Brownsville, TX, my State

shares a 1,200-mile border with Mexico. If you were daring enough to attempt to walk that entire stretch, you would trek through deserts, cross mountains, through cities, and probably end up getting a little wet in the Rio Grande River. You would meet folks who are proud of the strong bonds our country has with our southern neighbor. Many, of course, have relatives in both countries. You would talk to sheriffs, police officers, Border Patrol agents, all who care deeply about protecting our communities. And undoubtedly, you would end up eating some good Tex-Mex along the way.

In my time in the Senate, I have had the opportunity to meet countless Texans who live and work along the southern border, and I seek their advice and counsel on what Congress ought to do, what the Federal Government ought to do to protect them and their communities. What they tell me is that Texans and the Nation rely on the billions of dollars of legitimate trade that comes across the ports of entry with Mexico. But with the growing volume of goods crossing our borders and the persistent staff shortages for Customs and Border Protection, they want to make sure there are no security gaps that can be exploited by criminals or slow down the legal movement of goods. That is a concern I share, and I continue to advocate for additional improvements in our ports of entry to protect this vital lifeline for our economy, as well as our security.

But just as these communities care deeply about the economic benefits of our shared border, they care deeply, of course, about their own safety and security. They believe that both can peacefully coexist, and so do I.

During my visits, I have witnessed some of the horrific treatment that migrants receive at the hands of the criminals, including those who smuggle them. The truth is, these criminal organizations that move people and drugs and contraband across our border exploit our porous border and care nothing for human life. It is a commodity. It is the way they make money. They care nothing for the people they hurt, so they wring another dollar out of someone else's misery on a daily basis. It is a high-volume business, too, and incredibly lucrative.

I have seen the stash houses with windows lined with tin foil, and inside, a veritable cesspool that makes you want to gag or lose what you had for lunch. This is where the human smugglers cram large groups of illegal immigrants in unimaginable conditions while awaiting their transit to the interior of the United States.

I have seen their logbooks where they record their corrupt transactions, correlating real-life human beings with their value in dollars and cents.

I have talked to Border Patrol agents who have discovered tractor trailers full of people attempting to enter our country, some of whom never complete their journey because they die from ex-

posure or are smothered to death in the cramped quarters.

In Brooks County, TX, where the Falfurrias checkpoint of the Border Patrol is located, about 50 miles north of the border, I have seen unmarked graves of the migrants who were trying to cross vast swaths of South Texas in the August heat in order to bypass the Border Patrol checkpoint but then were left to die by the smugglers. Their graves are marked only with identities like "skull case" or "unknown female."

Border security is not immoral, as Speaker PELOSI has shamefully claimed, but refusing to act in the face of evil is immoral. It is clear that there is a crisis, as it is clear that it is our responsibility to restore safety and security and order. In my wildest dreams, I never would have imagined we would be debating whether we should secure our borders, as we apparently are now. That is something on which we should all agree. Instead, we should be focused on how to secure our borders and how to do it in a smart, responsible way.

In my experience, learning from the experts, they tell me there is no one-size-fits-all solution. You can imagine that with a 1,200-mile border with just Texas and Mexico, with the variety of topography and geography, one-size-fits-all does not work. What works best in the Rio Grande Valley doesn't necessarily work in an urban environment like El Paso, with Juarez right across the international bridge.

We need to customize solutions that meet the specific need rather than trying to dictate from here in Washington—thousands of miles away—a solution that solves nothing. We need to look at border security as a combination of three things: physical infrastructure—yes, that includes barriers, walls, fences, vehicle barriers in appropriate locations, but it also includes technology—radar, ground sensors, drones, aerostats. This is a layered approach that provides flexibility for the experts on the ground to determine what is best for each sector, what is best for each part of our immense border, and implement the changes necessary to achieve desired results. As I said, in many areas, the landscape and location mean physical barriers may not be needed and may not be practical. In rural areas, technology—sensor technology or cameras—may be sufficient, but we know we need additional boots on the ground, too, because it is not enough to put a barrier in place or have a radar or ground sensor in place if you don't have the Border Patrol to show up and detain people they discover trying to make their way illegally into the United States or bringing drugs into the United States. So some combination of these three elements I think is always going to be needed, no matter where you are talking about.

I am proud of the work we have done in the Senate, generally speaking, and

I know when we work together we can do a lot of good, but logic and experience should tell us we shouldn't be the ones deciding how every inch of our southern border is secure. I don't claim to be an expert, although I have gone to school on the topic and spent a lot of time talking to those people who are experts and learning from them. I believe we need to let those experts drive the decision-making process on the right combination of resources needed to achieve operational control of the border. Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues' refusal to invest in real border security has landed us in a partial government shutdown resulting in 800,000 Federal workers who on Friday will not get a paycheck. That is unnecessary. Unfortunately, they are collateral damage to a political game which we should not be playing. I know many of these 800,000 Federal workers are already anxious about how they will make a car payment or how they will pay their mortgage or their rent or how they will put food on the table. It is completely unnecessary, this shutdown.

I am afraid this debate on border security of course is not really a debate about border security at all; it is a way for congressional Democrats to take a stand against a President they oppose while putting border communities at risk and sending the men and women who protect them to work without pay. This battle has gone on too long, and I can only hope Speaker PELOSI and Minority Leader SCHUMER show some leadership rather than continue to take the low road. This shouldn't be about winning a partisan fight; it should be about protecting our citizens and stemming the tide of illegal immigration, drugs, and contraband entering our country. If there were ever a time, now is the time for common sense to prevail and end this senseless shutdown.

REMEMBERING RICHARD ARVIN OVERTON

Mr. President, on another matter, I want to share a few words about an American hero I had the pleasure to get to know, Mr. Richard Arvin Overton. Richard's story began more than a century ago on May 11, 1906, in Bastrop County, TX. Throughout his young life, he held a variety of jobs—landscaping, picking cotton, working at a furniture store, and building homes.

In 1940, Richard enlisted in the U.S. Army and began his military service at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. Serving with the 1887th Engineer Battalion, an all-Black unit, one of his first stops was Pearl Harbor, the day after what we now know as the West Loch Disaster.

In an interview in 2016, Richard recalled that day, seeing the water turn red from the blood of his brothers, saying: "I didn't look the same, but I got out all right." This was only the first stop on Richard's tour that led him to the Pacific theater. His service included stops in Guam, Palau, and Iwo

Jima, where he witnessed firsthand some of the darkest days in our country's modern history.

When the war ended, Richard returned to Texas and built a home on Hamilton Avenue. He originally reentered the furniture business and then began working for the State treasury department. At the ripe age of 85, Richard Overton decided to retire.

In 2013, the 107-year-old Richard Overton made his first trip to Washington, DC, with an Honor Flight. He was able to witness the memorial built to honor his service and his comrades who died in battle, a sight that brought him to tears.

While his military service alone deserves our praise, that is not the only thing that brought Richard to national attention. His comments about the keys to his longevity and long life and particularly his daily routine made Richard an internet sensation. His penchant for enjoying coffee with whiskey and 12 cigars a day won hearts and caused all of us to question the secret to his long life. Richard also enjoyed a bowl of ice cream every night—always butter pecan. He called this the Overton diet and welcomed anyone interested to give it a shot. Richard used his newfound fame to continue life as he always had but with more fans eager to stop by and say hello while he was sitting on the front porch. He continued to live in the same house he built after the war, although the street name has now been changed to carry his name—Richard Overton Avenue.

I first met Richard in 2013, and I remember the day my wife Sandy and I met him in his home in Austin. I was taken aback to learn he had just gotten through mowing his lawn that morning—107 years old and still mowing his lawn.

Sadly, on December 27, 2018, the story of this American hero came to an end. At the ripe old age of 112 years, Richard passed away, leaving a host of cousins and extended family members.

Yesterday, I introduced a resolution, with my colleague Senator CRUZ, to honor this great man, his military service, and his enduring legacy. Our country has lost a true patriot, our State has lost a legend, and our community has lost a dear friend.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WELCOMING NEW SENATORS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, a new year begins, and it brings us new challenges, new opportunities, and new faces in the 116th Congress.

I welcome the nine freshman Senators: Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee, Mr. BRAUN of Indiana, Mr. CRAMER of

North Dakota, JOSH HAWLEY of Missouri, MARTHA MCSALLY of Arizona, MITT ROMNEY of Utah, JACKY ROSEN of Nevada, RICK SCOTT of Florida, and KYRSTEN SINEMA of Arizona. Their talent and hard work brought them here, and now we have an expanded Senate Republican majority—a majority we built on in the 115th Congress. Albeit, we are still short of the 60 votes needed to pass most pieces of legislation, we have a group of people committed to the values of our party and our country and working together to find solutions for the Nation.

During the swearing-in last week, as I was sworn in to the Senate, my 96-year-old mother joined us. She attended, enjoyed it, watches the opening every day for the Pledge of Allegiance and for the prayer from Reverend Black, and looks to that as a sign of our Nation moving forward.

From the time I was a little boy, she would always say: "This is the most important year of your life." She started when I was very young, and I think her lesson remains today. For me and for all of us, this is the most important year of our lives, for ourselves, for our Nation, and for the world. She would say: What you do this year makes a big difference for the future, so make sure you do it right. Well, we are now at a point of divided government—Democrats control the House and Republicans the Senate. We need to work together and do it right on behalf of the American people.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, I think we have some immediate tasks; one is to secure the southern border and the other is to fund the government. These goals are not mutually exclusive. We can and we must do both, and the key to breaking the current impasse is for both parties to work together.

President Trump, I believe, is absolutely right to insist on border wall funding. I think he is right to insist on it before agreeing to sign spending legislation to end the shutdown, and he spoke passionately and I think spoke convincingly about it last evening. If the southern border were a patient—and I practiced medicine for 24 years in Wyoming—if the southern border were a patient admitted to the hospital, it would be listed in critical condition.

All Americans want an immigration system that secures the border, enforces the law, and that keeps families together. The problem of course is the rise in illegal entry, terrorists, drug smugglers, human traffickers, the Mexican drug cartels, all exploiting our porous border with Mexico. The Customs and Border Protection Commissioner has called the situation a "border security and humanitarian crisis." That is what we are dealing with, a border security and humanitarian crisis.

Here are the numbers from the Department of Homeland Security. Currently, 16,000 Border Patrol agents and 8,100 military troops guard the south-

ern border. The National Guard has been deployed there continuously since 2006. Still, illegal border crossings increased dramatically from 2017 to 2018.

In this past year, the year just ended, 396,000 people were stopped at the border, including 3,700 suspected terrorists and 800 gang members. Of the border's 1,950 miles, a physical barrier today protects about 650 miles. Border Patrol areas with enhanced or expanded barriers have been successful. They have seen a 90-percent decrease in illegal traffic. That is why the President wants to continue with additional physical barriers to protect the border.

There is a huge improvement due to the wall. Clearly, walls work, barriers work. So I ask: Why is NANCY PELOSI, the House Speaker, prolonging the shutdown by denying critical funding? She has called the wall immoral. I would say what is immoral is refusing to provide for the safety and security of the American people by providing border security.

Border security policymaking has always been bipartisan but not now, it seems. The Pelosi plan to end the partial shutdown isn't serious policy; it is political posturing. I say there is a partial government shutdown because 75 percent of the government continues to be funded. The Speaker's proposal includes billions in wasteful spending while ignoring the crisis at the border. The President has promised to veto what she is proposing, but instead of negotiating, the Speaker is basically playacting.

What is needed is an agreement between the President and the Democratic leaders in the House and Senate that can pass the House and secure at least 60 votes in the Senate and then be signed into law.

As President Trump said in a January 4 letter to Congress, a nation that fails to control its borders cannot fulfill its basic obligations to its citizens, physical safety, economic safety, essential public services, and the uniform protection of our laws.

We cannot afford to play politics with the border. I think we should listen to the advice my mother continues to give me; that this is the most important year of your life. It is important for this body, for this institution, and for this Nation. Let's start 2019 and do it in the right way by passing common-sense legislation that does secure the border, that does reopen the government, and that protects the American people.

Let's work together to make this the most important year, the start of a better future for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. 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. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to share with the body today my very short New Year's wish list. It is very short because Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are all the same. We need to open the government. We need to reopen the one-quarter of the Federal Government that is shut down today. We need to start acting like adults. We need to start doing the job that we were sent here to do because our Nation's security is at stake, kids' health is at stake, and families' economic security is at stake.

Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers all across the country are furloughed as we speak, including over a thousand in Connecticut. But that is not the extent of the damage. When you start having folks at airport security not be able to show up for their jobs because they have to work somewhere else in order to put food on the table, when you start creating questions about whether food stamps are going to go out or Section 8 vouchers are going to get paid, when you can't have the Department of Agriculture functioning to help our farmers, you are starting to affect a whole lot of people. You are starting to drag down the entire economy.

My hope—my wish—is that we will reopen the Federal Government. The fact of the matter is that this happens every now and again. Occasionally, somebody makes a demand, something that they can't get through the normal political process, and they say if they don't get that demand, they are going to shut down the government. Every time I have been through one of these, it is the party making the demand that eventually relents because we tend to all agree that is not the proper way in order to try to get what you want in the U.S. Government.

Senator CRUZ and others shut down the government for 2 weeks because they wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Eventually, they relented. This time, President Trump couldn't get Congress to approve \$5 billion for his wall in the budget so he decided to shut down the government. This is not how we should conduct a debate about legitimate public policy issues.

The future of the American healthcare system was a legitimate public policy issue, as is the security of our borders, but we shouldn't be having the discussion amidst a government shutdown—trying to use our Nation's security and all of these Federal workers and the work they do as hostages to try to achieve a political result.

Of course, we were all on the same page just a few weeks ago. This body voted unanimously to open the Federal Government, and now Senator McCONNELL says that piece of legislation that all of us voted for in December can't pass.

What changed? What changed in each one of your States that causes so many Members of this body to now say that they cannot vote for a continuing resolution that you all voted for back in December?

We know what has changed. The only thing that has changed is that the President has decided that he will not sign it. That is not how the Constitution works.

The Constitution doesn't make the Senate subservient to the President. The Constitution certainly doesn't make the President's party subservient to him. No one here has to follow the orders of President Trump, especially when he is doing something that is bad for the Nation. We could bring up that same bill that reopens the government at least temporarily. We could all vote the same way that we did back in December. We could send that bill to the House of Representatives and admit that the President shouldn't dictate our votes. Just because his position changed doesn't mean Senate Republicans' position should have changed.

Let's reopen the government so that, then, we can have a discussion about the question of immigration law and border security, because I am more than willing to have it.

OK, I didn't exactly tell the truth. I do have two other wishes beyond reopening the government, but they are connected to my primary wish. My second wish is that the President would stop making up things as he proceeds through this debate. The worst of his lies was the idea that there were 4,000 known or suspected terrorists who came across our southern border. That was a number proffered by the Press Secretary at the White House. It has been repeated in various ways, shapes, and forms by the President's allies.

Of course, we now know there have not been 4,000 suspected terrorists that have come across the southern border. There have been six since the beginning of this year. That is six people on a terrorist watch list who were not U.S. citizens. Do you know how many people who fit that description came across the northern border in the first 6 months of this year? Forty-one. If you really care about the security of this country—if your primary reason for getting up every morning is to make sure terrorists don't get into this country, then we should be putting up a wall with Canada, not a wall with Mexico.

The second fiction is that all of these drugs coming into the United States are crossing the U.S.-Mexican border at places where there isn't a wall. That is not true either. The vast majority of illegal products that come into this country come through ports of entry. We should all talk about why that is and what we can do to beef up protections, but putting up a wall along the treacherous portions of the Rio Grande are not going to stop smugglers who right now can find lots of other ways to get their goods into the United States.

I want to make sure that when we have this debate, we are having a fact-based debate.

My second wish in this new year is that the President and his allies would just start telling the truth, and the

truth is that there is not a new security crisis at the southern border. Illegal crossings have been coming down since 2000. The people who are on the terrorist watch list who occasionally do try to come into this country are predominantly trying to get in through Canada, not through Mexico.

I want to talk about facts.

Here is my last wish. Again, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are to reopen the government. If I had No. 6 and 7, it would be that the President start talking about the real facts, and the other would be this: Let's not get into this very dangerous conversation about trying to do an end-around on the political process with a national emergency. I guess I am talking to my Republican colleagues here.

I get it that I often have some of the sharpest words for this President, but I hope that we can come together on the idea that declaring a national emergency because you can't get what you want through the political process is a really bad precedent to set. It is true that there are a whole bunch of national emergencies that have been declared, but none of the circumstances of those national emergencies and none of the powers that were utilized in those national emergencies compare to what the President is reportedly considering.

If the President is really talking about declaring a national emergency on our border, despite the fact that there is no set of facts that suggests that what is happening on our border is fundamentally different today than what was happening a year ago or 10 years ago, and if the President is really contemplating, by Executive order, reprogramming billions of dollars this Congress set aside for military construction projects to a border wall, that is a Pandora's box that, once opened, cannot be shut again. This is a genie escaping out of a bottle that will not be put back.

I said in jest last night that if President Trump can use a national emergency declaration to build a border wall, what would stop a Democratic President from declaring a healthcare emergency and passing and declaring a national emergency to create a single-payer healthcare system in this country? I wouldn't advise a Democratic President to do that, but I am not sure what the precedent would be if President Trump, having not been able to get Congress and the American public to get behind a border wall with Mexico that nobody really wants, declares a national emergency and builds it anyway. What would then stop any future President from doing the same thing on a host of other policy areas? Really, what would stop a President from declaring a healthcare national emergency because he or she can't get their legislation passed through the Senate and reordering our insurance markets and our Medicare and Medicaid programs to cure that national emergency, simply shifting money around from place to place?

I don't think this is an avenue that the Federal Government should go down because there will be a Democratic President someday, and if you can just declare a national emergency and move billions of dollars around because you can't get your way in Congress, that is a horse that, once out of the barn, is not coming back.

That is my wish list: Open the government, open the government, open the government, open the government; pass the bills that we passed back in December. Don't let the President dictate your votes. Let your constituents dictate your votes.

I hope the President and the White House start telling the truth about what is really happening with border security, and I hope this nonsense about declaring a national emergency goes away. I hope it goes away in part because Republicans in this body recognize the really dangerous precedent that sets for this country, and they recommend publicly and privately to the President that he shutter that idea.

We could reopen the government today. If Senator MCCONNELL came down here and decided to put a continuing resolution before this body and said that it is the right thing to do for the country, it would pass with flying colors. If Senator MCCONNELL exercised that kind of leadership that he has shown in previous shutdowns, it would pass with flying colors. We all know it would. I am sure there would be a handful of Republicans who just got elected with President Trump's support who might not support it, but it would pass just like it passed 3 weeks ago, and it would likely pass the House of Representatives by a veto-proof margin, as well, once the signal was given by Senate Republicans that the adults need to step up and reopen the government.

So this whole crisis can be over tonight. It can be over tonight if there is some leadership shown by Senate Republicans. Why spend all of this time trying to control this body? Why spend millions of dollars trying to run for office to become the majority party in the U.S. Senate if you are not willing to step up in a moment of crisis and lead the country through it? It is still possible, and I hope, as my new year's wish, that it gets done sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise to speak on U.S. national defense.

In the last couple of years, we have made tremendous progress in strengthening our military and have effectively

realigned our global posture and strategy.

Under the new national defense strategy, the United States has rightfully recognized the return to great power competition, where our priorities have shifted from low-intensity conflict to posturing against peer and near-peer adversaries.

Over the last 17 years of combat in the Middle East, U.S. dominance and deterrence against great power competitors have diminished. Meanwhile, nations like China and Russia have undertaken extraordinary military modernization efforts while engaging in unprecedented and destabilizing aggression.

We have seen Russian intrusions in cyberspace, the illegal annexation of Crimea, information attacks on Western democratic institutions, and the spread of lies, half-truths, and slander in order to sow division and chaos between the United States and other partners.

These gray-zone activities, which are actions below the level that would provoke an armed conflict, have gone mainly unchecked by the United States, which has set a troubling precedent and only serve to encourage further provocation.

From China, we see these gray-zone techniques manifested in their land reclamation in the South China Sea, the construction of their first foreign military installations in Djibouti, and the continuing theft of intellectual property and trade secrets in critical security areas.

They have also greatly undermined our supply chain through the Made in China 2025 initiative, which seeks to ensure that the United States and others remain reliant on the Chinese industrial base.

Above all, the United States is threatened by Russia's and China's advances in emerging technology. This includes hypersonic weapons, artificial intelligence, space capabilities, quantum computing, and directed energy.

Without significant resources and focus, we will lose our technological superiority in these very areas, and both U.S. national security and the global order will be in serious jeopardy.

Building off of our successes from the last 2 years, Congress and the executive branch must remain committed to investing in research, development, rapid acquisition, and the deployment of capabilities that provide for deterrence in line with the threats of the 21st century.

Just as we rose to the challenge in the two World Wars, the Cold War, and following the attacks on September 11, 2001, we must, once again, evaluate our current posture and chart a course that best protects our national security and our interests.

While the national defense strategy correctly prioritizes a return to great power competition, we still have great national security threats in the low-intensity domain, particularly in the Middle East and in North Africa.

The success of our missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and Africa are important. They can be seen in our ability to prevent extremist groups from projecting attacks into the U.S. homeland.

Through the heroic and dedicated service of our men and women in uniform, we have put unyielding pressure on foreign terrorists and, in turn, we have prevented another massive attack like we saw on 9/11.

While we have seen tremendous battlefield success against groups like the Islamic State, counterterrorism and stability operations require a sustained commitment of presence and resources in order to consolidate gains and promote good governance and the rule of law. In the absence of the latter, ungoverned spaces quickly transform into breeding grounds for terror groups, and that is why we are in Iraq. That is why we are in Afghanistan, and that is why we should remain in Syria. We must do that until our objectives are met.

Balancing our approach toward both low- and high-intensity threats will require us to rely on our allies and our partners more than we have had to rely on them in the past decades, as we have a limited supply of resources for our national defense. However, if we are able to leverage the resources of our friends, we will assume less risk as we move to more resources toward countering great power threats. Likewise, as we seek to bolster our defense posture toward peer competitors, we will greatly benefit from increased contributions and commitments from our allies and our partners. That means insisting that our treaty allies contribute their fair share to the international security burden and also ensuring that our allies and partners are investing in weapons systems and military platforms that interoperate with ours while effectively deterring our common adversaries.

We cannot and should not abandon those who share our values of democracy and freedom but, rather, work with them to increase defense contributions and build necessary capabilities and capacities. Unlike Russia and China, our network of allies and friends, who have stood shoulder to shoulder with us in the defense of freedom and democratic values, are a source of great strength, as well as an integral part of promoting global security.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to once again acknowledge the most detrimental adversary of our national defense; that is, poor fiscal policy. As then-Secretary Mattis stated when he announced the National Defense Strategy, continuing resolutions and sequestration have hindered our security more than any foe. These wasteful applications of taxpayer dollars prevent long-term planning, stymie research and development, delay critical procurement, and prevent necessary training and readiness investments.

What we do in this Chamber has consequences that reverberate far beyond Washington. When we fail to do our job, we put our warfighters at higher risk and cripple our strategic posture, ultimately endangering our national security. That is why I have come to the floor today to urge bipartisanship and collaboration amongst both Houses of Congress on defense spending policy. The political climate of today will assuredly prevent progress in some areas of Congress's work, but I encourage my colleagues to set those differences aside when we consider policies and appropriations for our national defense.

We have a lot of work ahead in order to protect our security and interests, but I am confident we can come together to solve these issues of critical importance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, as our colleague from Iowa just pointed out, these problems not only need to be solved, but they are solvable. At the core of the debate we are having right now is obviously border security. Everybody says they are for border security, but they have different views of what that means.

I want to start by saying that I fully support the President's call for a more secure border, and, frankly, I think physical barriers are part of that. We have thought that for a long time. They work. People who now are opposed to them generally have often been for them.

In fact, a generation ago, we began improving and expanding barriers in a few areas along the southern border, and in every instance, they have made a difference.

In 1992, the U.S. Government built a wall in the San Diego sector of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the number of people caught crossing that border decreased by 95 percent when the barrier was erected.

The border is not exactly like a bank. You don't have to have a level of security that nobody can ever get through at any time, under any circumstances, but if you have a solution that solves 95 percent of the problem, that may be about all we can afford to do in terms of solving the problem that way. That barrier, that wall, that fence south of San Diego did exactly that.

The next year, we built a wall in El Paso, TX, at that part of the border, and there was a decrease of 95 percent there as well.

In 2000, we built a wall at the Tucson, AZ, sector, and apprehensions there dropped 90 percent.

We have a 90-percent solution or a 95-percent solution. That is reasonable to the American people who think that the job of the Federal Government—and they are right in this—that one of the jobs of the Federal Government is to secure its border.

You wouldn't have to look very far in troubled parts of the world to find a

story about Lebanon or some other country—to read that sentence that says: This government is not truly functional because they don't have control over their own borders. It is a reasonable expectation of government.

In 2000, as I said, we built a wall in Tucson.

You can call this whatever you want to. If you are offended when I say “wall” or “fence,” you say whatever you want to say—it has the same impact.

I have been to the border a number of times. I have walked along the barriers there. I have been on one side of the fence—the two sides of a fence with a patrolled roadway in between. It looked pretty effective to me, and the numbers indicate it was effective.

In 2005, when we added a wall in the Yuma part of the Arizona sector, apprehensions went down another 95 percent.

We have President Clinton and Presidents Bush—Bush 43 and Bush 41—all were part of thinking barriers worked, and the Congress was too. There was not an issue as to whether a wall works, where a wall works, until President Trump as a candidate began to talk about building a wall. They have made a big difference in the areas where we have tried them in the past.

The President has often said in recent days that the wall doesn't necessarily work everywhere, and I fully agree with that. We couldn't afford to have the wall everywhere, and if we did have the wall everywhere, you would have to monitor it with some remote monitoring device anyway because there are large sections of the border where there aren't people and where there is no access. It doesn't mean you can't monitor that. It doesn't mean you can't have that kind of a wall erected. We need to do that.

In November, there were nearly 52,000 people who were caught trying to sneak across the border. Now, you can act like that is not a very big problem—unless you have ever lived in a community of, say, 52,000 people, and then you realize that is a lot of people. And in 1 month alone, they were coming across the southwest border.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, nearly 17,000 criminals were apprehended trying to get into the country last year. That is about half of the population of the capital city of Missouri. Seventeen thousand people trying to get in with a criminal record just last year.

We have seen a 50-percent increase in gang members being caught trying to come into the country illegally and a 73-percent increase in the seizures of fentanyl.

One of the things we do in the health and human services area that I work in and appropriate for and work for an appropriate opioid response is try to figure out how we can get fentanyl out of this system, how we can get something out of this system that is deadly for a significant number of the people who

turn to that as they get addicted to painkillers. If the fentanyl seizures are up 73 percent over where they were the year before, something needs to be done. We clearly need to secure our borders.

I support the immigration system. I am a proponent of legal immigration. I think how we meet the workforce needs of the country, how we deal with the fact that we have people who are here who aren't legal, who have otherwise not gotten in trouble in the country—about half of them came across the border, and about half of them came in some other way and decided, this is a pretty doggone good place, and I want to stay here and am afraid to go home because I may not get back—how do we deal with that? How do we deal with this in a way that we meet our workforce needs, that the skill needs of the country are met? And skill needs can be unskilled people—we don't have people willing to do some unskilled jobs—and highly skilled people. We don't have enough people doing their jobs in an economy that is growing faster than the economy has grown in a long time. The economic numbers in some cases are better than they have been in 50 years and in most cases have been better than they have been in at least a decade.

Every part of the border doesn't need to be secured the same way, but the border needs to be secured. Our friends on the other side, in what has been a pretty impressive show of party unity, have just decided that they want to reject the options of how we secure the border. People who have voted to build and maintain almost 700 miles of border fencing have suddenly decided that another 50 miles or another 2 miles is immoral. Talk about selective immorality. That it is OK to have 700 miles of fence but it is not OK to have 702 miles of fence is a very interesting place, it seems to me, to draw the line.

Our friends on the other side have rejected attempts to fix the way we deal with children who are brought across the border or come across on their own. There are 48,000 children right now that the U.S. Government is doing their best to take care of—I hope and insist that we do that—who came across the border on their own. Another 2,600 or so came across the border with an adult. More often than not, that adult was their parent, but not always. We have 50,000 children who came across the border, and there is no response to any ideas that the administration brings up, no positive response from the other side as to how to deal with that.

They have rejected adding beds at detention centers for people who are caught crossing the border illegally. Why would you do that? Why would you not want to have additional space for people who are in custody for illegal behavior? I suppose because it becomes so critically important that people just be released on their own recognition, to come back at a later time.

Some of our friends on the other side, in fact, have called for the complete

abolition of U.S. Customs and Immigration Enforcement efforts. At the very time when these are some of the most stressed people working on behalf of the country for the Federal Government, we have people on the other side saying we should eliminate border enforcement.

We had a bill introduced in this Chamber last year that every Member of the minority supported. When you read it closely—I am not at all sure they all did because I don't believe this is the position they all had, but when you read it closely, it was a clear open borders bill. There was no way anybody was likely to be apprehended crossing the border except just to tell them "You know you are here legally now. Come back sometime, and we will see if we can figure out what to do."

We are for protecting people who are uniquely at risk in the country that they come from.

Asylum is an important thing. No country in the history of the world has been any more open than we have been to allowing people to come here legally, to have people who legally seek asylum come here. But the truth is, there is no asylum granted just because you are from a poor country or from a dangerous country, so most of the people who come saying that they are seeking asylum don't get it. Maybe that is why most of them don't show up in court. They know that their argument—they would rather be here than where they are from, but their argument will never work in court for most of them, and that is clearly understood.

We are going to have a lot better opportunity to solve the problems we need to solve regarding the border if people have confidence that the government has done a reasonable job of securing the border. I don't think anybody expects the border in a big country like ours to be so impenetrable that nobody could ever get in under any circumstances. I think they do expect that when you have found the 90- or 95-percent solution, appearing until now to be affordable and widely supported—when you have found the 90-percent solution, people do expect that at the very least that you would apply the 90-percent standard to the responsibility of the government to secure its borders.

So whether it is trying to figure out what we need in our workforce to have a continued growing and vibrant economy or it is trying to figure out what we do about people who have come here and decided to stay, whether they came here across the border or in some other way but stayed beyond the time they were supposed to be here or got here without going through the normal process—those are going to be much easier to come to a conclusion on if people know that the government has done its job to get the border under an acceptable and anticipated level of security, which we would expect to have in a country as strong and vibrant as ours.

Particularly for people who were brought here and grew up here, this is an 80-percent issue in the Congress and in the country. Virtually nobody thinks kids who grew up here and didn't get in significant trouble shouldn't be allowed to live in the country they grew up in. Frankly, we need them. We need young people entering the workforce. We need people who are, in almost all cases, highly motivated.

I talked to a university president just this week who said that these kids are the kids who, over and over again, set the standard. They are the kids who, over and over again, prove why we want them to be in our country.

These problems will be much more solvable if we will just deal with the one fundamental problem of controlling our borders, of having immigration laws that work.

I hope, as was mentioned earlier today, that we can get to this conclusion and get to this conclusion quickly. This is obviously a place where we need to come together. Not only does the government need to function, but this is an issue we need to solve, and I guarantee that all of these related issues will be more easily solved if we secure the border.

No President has ever had the credibility that this President will have if he says to the American people: I have met my commitment. The border is secure. We are now continuing to work to be sure that the court systems work, that we have protected those people who protect us on the border. There is great credibility here if the President is willing to get to a place that he can say that.

I think his efforts to secure the border are significant steps toward allowing us to solve the other problems we need to solve, and we need to solve them sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:20 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COTTON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CONSTITUTING THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 12, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 12) to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 12) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CONSTITUTING THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 13, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 13) to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 13) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. 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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, this shutdown is not a negotiation situation. This is a hostage situation.

The President of the United States has taken 800,000 Federal workers, tens of thousands of Federal contractors, and thousands of small businesses hostage to extort money for his vanity wall.

We have all heard from our constituents about the pain the shutdown is causing. This Friday many government employees will miss their first paycheck as a result of the shutdown. Most of us live in a world where we need paychecks, and it is obvious that our constituents shouldn't have to "make adjustments," as the President frames it, for the President's shutdown.

Our 800,000 Federal workers aren't the only people in our country feeling the impact of the shutdown. The situation is inflicting unnecessary pain on our government contracting community and small businesses that rely on the day-to-day operations of the Federal Government, not to mention the millions of Americans who request government services.

Let me just tell one story. Michelle Baker is a Federal contractor in Waikiki who helps the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies to write reports in a way that is accessible to the public. Michelle told Honolulu Civil Beat that she and her husband have resorted to taking out a payday loan with an exceptionally high interest rate to pay for their food this week.

Let me be clear. There are two people who can end the pain of the shutdown right now—Donald Trump and Senate majority leader MITCH MCCONNELL. The President has demonstrated repeatedly that his word is not good. He is an amoral hostage taker, and you cannot and should not negotiate with a hostage taker.

Senator MCCONNELL, on the other hand, has not held back in exercising his power when he saw fit to do so. Senator MCCONNELL had no problem using his power to unilaterally deny Judge Merrick Garland to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. Senator MCCONNELL had no problem using his power to lower the number of Senators it would take to confirm nominees to the Supreme Court, starting with Neil Gorsuch. Senator MCCONNELL had no problem using his power to force the Senate to come within one vote of denying healthcare to millions of Americans by bringing forth a bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Senator MCCONNELL had no problem using his power to ram through a huge tax cut for the wealthiest Americans and corporations at the expense of middle-class families.

Senator MCCONNELL has the power to end the shutdown by bringing up the legislation that the House has sent us—the same legislation that passed the Senate last Congress—to get the full government open and running again.

We should all be asking: Why won't Senator MCCONNELL use his power to

help 800,000 Federal workers and tens of thousands of government contractors get their paychecks? No one needs to remind Senator MCCONNELL that Congress is a separate branch of government. The Senate can act without the hostage taker President's consent or assent.

Since the amoral President has hunkered down with his hostage strategy, I call on Senator MCCONNELL to use his power to do his job as Senate majority leader. More Members of his own caucus are coming forward every day and calling on him to act, regardless of whether the President threatens or promises a veto.

It is time for Senator MCCONNELL to stand up to Donald Trump and for the Senate to do our job and end this shutdown.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor on what is now day 19 of the Trump shutdown—an epic Presidential temper tantrum that forces the rest of us to, once again, plead with the President to stop hurting the American families he promised to represent. This time, it is because President Trump marched our country right into a government shutdown, paralyzing Federal Agencies and preventing them from carrying out the most basic government functions.

What does this government have to show for it? Eight hundred thousand hard-working Americans, some off the job and some still asked to come in. Their bills are mounting and no money is coming in. That includes the air traffic controllers in my home State of Washington who wrote me letters. They don't question whether they will keep showing up to do the job they love—a job that keeps the public safe—but they have no idea when they will get their next paycheck. That means stress, stress about providing for their families, stress about being able to pay their mortgages, pay for preschool, pay down post-Christmas bills. They are forced to bear the brunt of this Trump shutdown.

It is not just Federal workers. Thousands of senior citizens and individuals with disabilities are facing possible eviction as HUD scrambles to figure out how to make housing payments. Our national parks, the crown jewels of our country, are no longer adequately maintained for public use, while the small businesses right outside the parks that rely on visitors, like those

outside Mount Rainier National Park in my home State of Washington, are feeling the pain and cutting back on staffing. Our farmers and our tree fruit growers are unable to get their applications processed through the shuttered Farm Service Agency. Millions of low-income families are now unsure if they will receive the help they need to put food on the table for their children in the coming weeks.

I could go on, but I don't need to. With each passing day, it is very clear just how much this Trump shutdown is hurting families in every community in every State of our country, and no prime time address or fearmongering trip to the border is going to change that reality.

To President Trump, I say: Enough with the tweets, enough with the fact-twisting. It is time to stop playing politics and finally agree to end this shutdown that you began. Stop trying to bully your way out of this mess.

To my Senate colleagues, I say: In case it is not crystal clear, ending this nightmare is not complicated. Three weeks ago, in this very spot, we passed a bill that kept the Federal Government open without funding Trump's wasteful wall, the one he promised Mexico would pay for. That bill was very simple. It was all about keeping our government open and avoiding a completely unnecessary crisis.

Democrats supported the bill. Republicans supported it. In fact, it passed unanimously because we know the people we represent have no interest in elected officials playing games with their lives and livelihoods.

Now the Democratic House has followed suit. They have passed a bill that will do the same thing. Yet that simple solution—keeping our government funded, on schedule, and without interruption—has been stopped in its tracks by President Trump, who apparently sees no problem with keeping the government shut down for months or even years, as he said, all to fulfill a shallow campaign promise that everyone knows will do nothing to truly address our broken immigration system and keep our country safe.

What we have here is a crisis of the President's own making, from top to bottom. I, for one, find it simply outrageous that instead of searching for real solutions or working with Congress in good faith, the President is dug in and demanding American taxpayers bail him out to save face.

Members of this Congress were elected to make decisions that help the American people. We were not sent here to provide cover for the President.

I urge my Republican colleagues to make it your priority to work with us to fund our government and end this completely unnecessary crisis.

This started out as a Trump shutdown, but with every day that passes that the Republican Senate will not act, Republican leaders take more and more ownership, along with every Republican Senator who supports them.

Some Republicans in the Senate are already standing up, and I commend them. They want to work with us to stand up to President Trump and to end this shutdown, and they would like the opportunity to vote to do just that, but not enough yet, and the clock is ticking.

I say this to Republican leaders: Work with us to restore certainty to the American people—from the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who are being forced to forgo their paychecks to the small business owners, to the farmers, to the seniors and low-income families, to the air traffic controllers and all those people whose lives are being unnecessarily thrown into chaos and who deserve a fully functioning government.

The President of the United States may be throwing a tantrum and playing political games, but the people we represent and our country as a whole deserve a whole lot better.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. It is now day 19 of the Trump shutdown, 19 days that the Federal Government of the oldest democracy and the world's only superpower has been functioning on only half of its cylinders.

I have spoken multiple times about the devastating impact this reckless and unnecessary shutdown is having on the Federal workforce at domestic departments and agencies—departments like Homeland Security, Agriculture, Transportation, Justice, Interior, and Commerce, agencies like Customs and Border Patrol, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the National Park Service.

These departments and agencies have furloughed and stopped paying hundreds of thousands of employees who, as a result, are idle and no longer able to do the jobs that millions and millions of Americans depend on. Hundreds of thousands more are working without pay until the shutdown ends.

The President, a billionaire who has never had to worry about not being able to pay the rent, says he can relate. If he actually believes that, he is alone.

Programs are on hold, and contracts are being cancelled, for which the Federal Government is liable for penalties. Government shutdowns don't save money; they cost billions of dollars and have lasting consequences. And who pays? American taxpayers.

This is a disgrace, and it is made even more so by the fact that it is entirely avoidable were it not for the intransigence, indifference, and obsession of one person, President Donald Trump.

An obsession not with border security—we are all for that, and there is more than a billion dollars in prior appropriations for border security waiting to be spent. In fact, we have offered another \$1.3 billion for fiscal year 2019. The White House never says anything about that.

No, the President's myopic obsession—repeated on national television last night—is with building a 30-foot-high wall—mostly on desolate land that the government will have to seize from private owners—along our southern border. The price tag to U.S. taxpayers would be at least \$18 billion and likely more, a price tag that at campaign rally after campaign rally he promised Mexico would pay.

There are multiple reasons why that is a terrible idea, why it won't stop illegal migration, why it won't stop illicit drugs, and why it would be a colossal waste of taxpayer dollars, which I have discussed before and will again.

Today I want to speak briefly about the impact the Trump shutdown is having not on the Federal Government's domestic programs and workforce, but its impact on U.S. national security and global leadership.

It is worth asking: What made the United States the world's superpower and a global leader in the first place?

Of course, one reason is our superior Armed Forces. That, I suspect, is the answer President Trump would give, but he would be only partly correct.

Even more important are the ideals enshrined in our Constitution and Bill of Rights, our democratic institutions and coequal branches of government, our diverse citizenry, and our regional and global alliances and partnerships. Without these, our men and women in uniform would have precious little to defend.

Today, the global supremacy and influence of the United States are being challenged like no time since the Cold War with the former Soviet Union. Why? One need look no further than 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Since his first days in office, President Trump has disparaged long-standing friends and allies. He has withdrawn from international agreements negotiated by past Republican and Democratic administrations, announced plans to withdraw from a key nuclear nonproliferation treaty, and proposed drastic cuts to the operations and programs of the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, which implement foreign policy.

Now the State Department, like other Federal departments and agencies, is swept up in the Trump shutdown.

Our choices are obvious: We can engage with the world by affirming our commitment to our ideals, by continuing to strengthen our democratic institutions, by empowering our diplomats and by expanding our global alliances and partnerships.

Or we can withdraw, even to the point of shutting down the Federal

Government, cede the global stage to others whose interests are often adverse to our own, and become the captives of simplistic campaign slogans, xenophobic antimigrant hysteria, and a manufactured national security emergency.

The President said the country needed a "good" shutdown. He said that: a "good" shutdown. There is no such thing.

He said he would be "proud" to take the "mantle of blame" for shutting down the government. Then the next day he blamed Democrats, rejecting out of hand our proposal to pass the six appropriations bills that already received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Republican-controlled Senate.

Most of those bills have nothing to do with border security, but the President is obstinately holding hostage thousands of Federal programs funded in those bills, including the paychecks for the people who implement them, which harms all Americans.

With a stroke of a pen, the President could reopen the government and continue negotiations on border security; yet he refuses, and instead he flipantly said the shutdown could last "months" or even "years."

What has this reckless abuse of executive power meant for our standing in the world? What has it meant for our diplomats at the State Department and in our embassies overseas whose job is to protect our global interests, to maintain our alliances and partnerships, to assist the millions of Americans working, studying and serving overseas, and to protect our security?

As of yesterday, 34 percent—more than one-third—of U.S. direct-hire State Department employees in Washington and at our embassies around the world have been furloughed. That is nearly 10,000 employees at the State Department alone who are unable to do their jobs. Others are working without pay.

If the shutdown continues, more paychecks will be withheld, the number of furloughed employees will increase, and there will be a parallel shutting down of diplomacy, of programs, of contracts, and of our ability to engage with both allies and adversaries.

The effects are far reaching.

The Bureau of Diplomatic Security will run short of funds, forcing the State Department to deplete resources used to keep other programs operating order to protect our diplomats and facilities overseas or eventually relying on unpaid contractors to do the job.

Roughly 85 percent of the employees of the State Department's Office of Inspector General have already been furloughed. Oversight of waste, fraud, and abuse has virtually ground to a halt.

Vietnam, a country of nearly 100 million people bordering China, is becoming a key security partner in the Pacific region; yet thanks to the Trump shutdown, key employees at our embassy and USAID mission in Hanoi

were furloughed. The American flag is flying, and the lights are on, but that is about it.

This is illustrative of what is happening in every region of the world, and it does not take a lot of imagination to predict the consequences of a longer shutdown.

For example, the State Department and U.S. Embassies regularly use their social media accounts to update Americans overseas of important developments that potentially threaten their safety. This was the case during the recent tsunami in Indonesia. How will the State Department respond to the next natural disaster when its social media accounts—tools that are relied on increasingly in today's world—have fallen silent?

What about the loss of U.S. influence on the world stage? With most official travel suspended, how do we ensure that our priorities are protected at the next trade, arms control, or international health summit?

What do you suppose the leaders of China, Russia, Iran, Syria and North Korea—not to mention allies like Great Britain, Canada, and Japan—think about this?

If I were President Putin, or President Xi Jinping, or Ayatollah Khamenei, I would be celebrating. What could be better than U.S. Embassies operating on life support and U.S. diplomats sidelined, while the U.S. Government is shut down over building a wall across the southwest desert?

Does President Trump think the rest of the world will sit idly by, waiting until the U.S. Government reopens? The opposite will happen. They will take full advantage in ways that will not be short lived.

While massive humanitarian crises imperil the lives of millions of people in Yemen, Syria, Burma, Venezuela, and Central Africa, the White House is embracing a diminishing role for the United States.

While Russia meddles in our elections and expands its influence in the Middle East, while China buys the allegiance of countries in Africa, Asia, and our own hemisphere by investing billions in ports, energy and transportation projects, the State Department is shutting down programs and sending its people home.

It is not just the State Department. USAID, the Peace Corps, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, they are all furloughing personnel and canceling new activities.

With the exception of the U.S. military, if this drags on, the United States will be a superpower in name only. An exaggeration? Don't bet on it.

While our diplomats are furloughed, rather than use the funds Congress already provided for border security that remain unspent, the President has threatened to ignore the legislative process, declare a national emergency where none exists, and order the Pentagon to pay for the wall that he swore Mexico would pay for.

Such a flagrant, unwarranted misuse of authority and circumvention of the democratic process would be immediately challenged by Congress and in the courts.

Regardless of the outcome, what would it say about our commitment to democracy around the world? How would it be perceived outside this country, particularly by autocrats in Syria, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, Brazil, Egypt, Russia, Hungary, Poland, or China?

It would be welcomed as a green light for declaring a state of emergency and wielding unchecked executive power—without regard for the legislature or judiciary—as a pretext to do virtually anything. Shut down the independent press. Arrest judges and opposition political leaders. Use the army to police the streets. Close the borders. All in the name of a manufactured national emergency.

This is already happening. In Guatemala, which purports to be a democracy, President Morales is openly defying rulings by constitutional court magistrates who are courageously defending the institutions of justice that are under assault, and the police are ignoring orders of the attorney general.

In Egypt, President al Sisi has locked up tens of thousands of political opponents and other dissidents. In Turkey, President Erdogan has done the same. President Trump has praised both leaders.

In Brazil, President Bolsonaro, a former military officer, has vowed to open up the Amazon to mining, logging, and agribusiness. He wants to give the police a free hand to use lethal force with impunity. He is gearing up to crack down on civil liberties. The White House has applauded.

No one disputes that the United States has experienced national emergencies, when we faced a potentially existential threat. Pearl Harbor and the 9/11 attacks are obvious examples. The Cuban missile crisis could have been.

A future deadly disease pandemic that infects thousands of Americans and rapidly spreads out of control might qualify.

The President talks as if the sky is falling in Texas, but any rational person recognizes that the situation on our southwest border is not remotely a national emergency. To call Central American families fleeing poverty and violence a threat to the security of the world's wealthiest, most powerful country is an embarrassment, especially when the Border Patrol's own data shows the number of migrants apprehended at the southern border has plummeted over the past 10 years.

The White House, grasping for arguments to justify the President's broken campaign promise that Mexico would pay for his wall, has played fast and loose with the facts in a desperate attempt to incite fear among the American people.

The President and Vice President have shamelessly trumpeted all kinds

of wildly inaccurate and grossly misleading statistics about migrants, terrorists, asylum applicants, unaccompanied children, and illegal drugs that are contradicted by their own agencies.

The White House says thousands of migrant terrorists have been apprehended, falsely suggesting they were stopped at the Mexican border. Almost none of them were.

We face a far greater threat from al Qaeda and ISIS using social media to inspire extremists already in the U.S. or Canada to commit terrorist acts. The last thing anyone would do who is genuinely concerned about terrorism is to shut down the government and withhold funding from the very agencies whose job it is to track down and arrest those people.

The real threat to our national security is shutting down the government, furloughing 10,000 State Department employees, telling our embassies to cancel programs and our diplomats to stay home.

While we come to grips with practical ways of strengthening our borders so we can more humanely and efficiently process migrants who request asylum, which we must do, we must also stay focused on the real threats to our national security.

We need our embassies at full strength. We need our diplomats in the room with their European, Russian, Chinese, South Korean, Central American, Middle Eastern, and African counterparts.

We need to strengthen NATO and our other alliances, so we can rely on our allies and partners to support us in responding to real national emergencies.

We need to expand our cyber security, nonproliferation, international broadcasting and other public diplomacy and internet freedom programs, military education and training, maritime security, law enforcement, and other international assistance programs. Instead, because of the President's obsession with the wall, these and other State Department programs are stuck in neutral, and the people who implement them are at home.

We need to act like a superpower at the United Nations, in NATO, and in the many other regional organizations where decisions are made that directly affect our interests and our security.

None of this is possible during a government shutdown, a shutdown that with each passing day erodes our democracy, weakens our global leadership, and threatens our security.

We all know this. The American people know this. The world knows this. The President needs to reopen the government and start acting like the defender of the Constitution and of our national security that the country needs.

I again urge the Republican leader to let us vote on the bipartisan, six-bill minibuss, and when it passes, he and the entire Republican Caucus should urge the President to sign it.

That is our job, as an independent, coequal branch of government: to vote,

to appropriate the funds so the Federal Government can work for the American people. It is not our job to sit on the sidelines while the wheels of government grind to a halt because the President is recklessly holding it hostage.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to set the record straight on the President's border wall—quite frankly, something he didn't talk about much last night during his speech to the country. But the truth is, this is where the problem is. So I want to talk about it a little bit today.

The President made it crystal clear—dozens of times, in fact—that he was prepared to shut down the government in order to get the \$5.7 billion for the wall, leading up to that speech last night. So here we are today, day 19 of President Trump's shutdown. Political gamesmanship? Well, that is nothing new in Washington, DC, but the fact is, our debates need to be grounded in facts. So here are the facts:

The President's demand for \$5.7 billion for a border wall is tall in hyperbole and wide on theatrics but short on facts.

Last night, the President said that Congress has refused to provide the resources needed to secure the border. That is not true. In fiscal year 2018, Congress gave the President \$1.3 billion to construct fencing and other fixed structures along the southern border. I know so because I worked side by side with my Republican colleagues to write that bill. Today, not one of those projects is under construction—not one.

Strong border security is much more than physical barriers. Congress appropriated \$21 billion for immigration enforcement and border security in last year's Homeland Security Appropriations Act. That includes money to expand manpower, increase technology, and utilize communication services and resources on top of funding for physical barriers.

Here is another fact: Hard narcotics like meth and cocaine and opioids are not coming over the border in backpacks; they are coming through our ports in cars and trucks. We have the technology to fix that, so let's appropriate the money toward real solutions at our ports to stop the drugs from entering our country, not \$5.7 billion for a wall.

So, again, let's stick to the facts. Despite having more than \$21 billion in border security and immigration enforcement funding, including funds for

physical barriers, the President has shut down the government to demand another \$5.7 billion exclusively for a wall.

One would think to ask, what would you possibly spend \$5.7 billion on, especially after already having \$21 billion to spend on border security and immigration enforcement? And we did ask him that. We asked him for a plan. We told the President and Homeland Security Secretary Nielsen that if they are going to break their promise to have Mexico pay for the wall and use American taxpayer dollars, they ought to produce a plan of action.

The plan we received in late December was incomplete—no analysis of alternative technologies, no analysis on the impact to communities, to landowners, to wildlife. And that plan only asked for \$1.6 billion, not the \$5.7 billion the President is now demanding.

The President has also failed to address private property rights and eminent domain. What is he going to do if a family refuses to sell off wide tracts of their farm or ranch to allow a wall to go through and split their ranch, divide their ranch? Are families going to cede their water and mineral rights? Is the administration prepared to enter into good-faith negotiations with literally thousands of families? And do we know how much that is going to cost the American taxpayer?

These questions need answers. Yet, with these questions still unanswered, there are folks in this body, the U.S. Senate, who are prepared to write a \$5.7 billion check to the President right now.

So here we are on day 19 of the President's shutdown. During the President's speech last night, he was right about one thing: There is a crisis taking shape in our country. But it is not the crisis on the southern border that he is trying to manufacture. As a result of the President's shutdown, there are 19,000 border agents today who are working without pay. There are 51,000 TSA agents working without pay. These are hard-working folks. They have families, they have mortgages, and they are being forced by the President to secure our country's borders and ports and airports while not knowing when their next paycheck will arrive.

I have heard from Border Patrol agents who moved across the country at their own expense so that they could be stationed along Montana's northern border. How have they been repaid for their willingness to serve? Well, they are not being paid. Not only do they have to absorb the moving costs, but now they have to pay for rent and cover other essential costs without a paycheck, and they are continually wondering when they will get paid next.

Look, at the end of last year, CBP's recruitment efforts finally started to bear fruit. For the first time in years, CBP began to achieve gains in hiring border agents. This shutdown not only

could, but I believe it will set back those efforts dramatically. Who could blame a family for passing on a job that could force you to work for free?

The President talked last night of a "sacred duty to America." I can think of few things more un-American than withholding pay from someone after an honest day's work.

But it is not just those stationed at the border and at our airports who are hurting because of the President's shutdown. I am going to give a small sample of letters and emails I have received from the folks from the great State of Montana since the shutdown began.

Ronald from western Montana says this:

I spoke to my son, a career Coast Guard member. He tells me that the Coast Guard is being directed to continue their duties without being paid due to this ridiculous shutdown. Senator, that is not right! Why do these brave men and women have to continue to risk their lives without being paid? My boy is worried about being evicted from his apartment with two young daughters and a wife because they won't receive their housing allowance! Please help fix this un-American situation.

Shilo from Bozeman writes:

I and other federal employees have been converted into political footballs for partisan politicians. My Christmas vacation was canceled and pay has been suspended during a time when some of us need the money the most. We are being disadvantaged and made to suffer while the comfortable and blithely unaffected cling to their arbitrary political ideologies and refuse to compromise.

Daren from northeast Montana:

I have a farm equipment loan that is at a standstill because the USDA is not picking up the phone. I have contractors and vendors who are waiting to be paid. The impact of this shutdown will last long after it ends.

Debra from Indian Country:

My daughters are federal employees proudly serving the Northern Cheyenne Tribe in Montana through the Indian Health Service. My daughters are both enrolled members of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, and both are single, hardworking mothers. My granddaughters are afraid their moms won't be able to pay the bills or buy groceries if the paychecks don't arrive. Morale is horrid in Lame Deer.

Please stop this immoral shutdown. It is very unfair to hardworking people like my daughters. They must work but will not get a paycheck this Friday if the shutdown continues.

Mr. President, this is what a crisis looks like, and this is a crisis you have created.

The President barely mentioned the wall last night in his address to the Nation. Yet we are here on day 19 of a government shutdown that is a direct result of his wish to build a wall from sea to shining sea.

It is time for the Senate to be the Senate. It is time for the folks in this body to quit making decisions based on politics and start making them based on facts.

The facts in this case are clear. There is no plan for \$5.7 billion for a border wall, Mexico will not pay for it, and the dysfunction of this administration

is causing real turmoil in the lives of 800,000 workers and their families.

I am calling on the majority to bring some common sense to this situation and to stand behind the bipartisan legislation that Republicans and Democrats have passed over the last several months—over the last month in particular—to reopen the government and put an end to this crisis.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to deliver a message to the hard-working agriculture producers in Nebraska and across America who feed the world.

At the end of last Congress, the House and Senate came together and passed a 5-year farm bill that provided the certainty and the predictability our farmers and ranchers needed during tough economic times. President Trump signed this important piece of legislation into law.

As a proud member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I had the privilege of working on this legislation and securing key provisions for Nebraskans. Among these were measures that protected crop insurance, streamlined trade promotion programs, bolstered opportunities for producers to use precision ag technology, and unleashed broadband deployment throughout rural America.

Because of this bill, folks in agriculture were feeling more confident about planning for the future. Now we find ourselves in the middle of a partial government shutdown, and there is some anxiety in farm country as funding to the U.S. Department of Agriculture has lapsed. In that regard, I want to provide some important updates to producers who are concerned.

The year-round sale of E15 is critical, and it is a critical issue for Nebraska's farmers, renewable fuel producers, and our rural communities. Our State has 25 ethanol plants that employ more than 1,300 hard-working Nebraskans with high-paying jobs, which are mostly located in rural communities, but for far too long, an outdated regulation that banned the sale of E15 during summer months has held our communities back.

Here in the Senate, I worked closely with a group of farm State colleagues to demonstrate the benefits of higher blends of ethanol fuel. I also championed bipartisan legislation, the Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, to allow for the sale of E15 year-round. Our efforts got President Trump's attention, and I was proud to support him last fall when he announced that he would direct the EPA to initiate the year-round sale of E15.

Through our continued efforts in the Senate and the action by President Trump to follow through on his promise, rural America is on the way to a major victory.

This week, some reports surfaced saying that the partial government shutdown is going to delay EPA's rule-making process for year-round E15. I would like to reassure our fuel producers that this is simply not true.

In fact, the EPA spokesman issued the following statement, saying:

This is a priority for both President Trump and Acting Administrator Wheeler. The ongoing partial shutdown will not impede EPA's ability to keep to our deadline.

I was pleased to learn that this rule-making process is still on track, and I want to make sure Nebraskans are aware of that fact as well.

Additionally, Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue announced he is extending the deadline for agriculture producers to apply for payments under the Market Facilitation Program. These payments are provided by the USDA's Trade Mitigation Program, which was a good-faith effort that recognized the economic hardship of our farmers and ranchers and the problems they were facing.

I have heard from Nebraskans who have applied for this program and who have received payments. Per Secretary Perdue's recent announcement, the Agency will extend the application deadline for the period of time equivalent to the number of days that the Farm Service Agency offices were closed during the shutdown. This should assist farmers who are interested in applying for the program but have been unable to do so during this partial shutdown. I understand the concerns of Nebraskans who are sincerely worried because USDA Farm Service Agency offices are closed.

Agriculture is the economic engine of the State of Nebraska. Across the State and in rural areas throughout our Nation, farmers are thinking about spring planting. They want to be able to plan ahead and make decisions about the future of their businesses. These hardships are real, and they are impacting Nebraska families. That is why I am continuing to have conversations with my colleagues about how we can come together in a sensible way that properly secures our border and ends these lapses in government funding.

Nebraskans know full well that I have long supported securing our border because it is a critical national security issue. I have visited the southern border, and I have spoken with our border agents. I have seen areas where a wall is necessary and other areas where technology or adding more border patrol is appropriate. Unfortunately, we have seen border security, an issue that has long had support from Republicans and Democrats, become deeply politicized.

As we continue to look and work toward a way forward, I want to keep

people updated and informed about the steps that our government continues to take to provide certainty, stability, and peace of mind to Nebraskans.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, yesterday I left my home in Cleveland and kissed my wife good-bye and headed to the airport early in the morning. I went to gates A, B, and C in the Cleveland Airport and talked to the TSA agents who are all working and working without pay.

Then, when I got to Washington—I flew into National Airport—I went straight to a building in Arlington where I talked to cafeteria workers. They are Federal contract workers who serve food at our Smithsonian museums and other Federal facilities. They don't work for the Federal Government. Their paychecks don't come from the Federal Government. They are contracted through a company and then paid by these companies. They have lost their jobs during the Trump shutdown.

These workers, making \$12, \$13, \$14—some with some seniority make \$15. They are union. They make 2 or 3 dollars more than the nonunion comparable workers. But they are not getting paid.

Unlike the 800,000 Federal workers, some working without pay, some furloughed—unlike them, if history is a judge, they will not get paid those lost wages. So these are people making \$12, \$13, \$14 an hour who have already lost 2 weeks of work because of the Trump shutdown, and unless Congress acts, they have no prospect to get that back pay. Again, their wages are at that level.

Then, last night, to sort of cap the day, in my apartment here I watched the President of the United States talk about his wall and dig in a little more.

You know, I wish President Trump would talk to the workers he is hurting with this shutdown. I wish that he would go out and, as President Lincoln used to say, get his "public opinion bath" and listen to these workers; that he would leave the White House or Mar-a-Lago, where he spends most of his time, and talk to these workers I talked to yesterday—the TSA workers in Cleveland who are working without pay. The anxiety levels are going up and up and up for these workers because this coming Saturday they will miss their first paycheck—and then beyond that too. This also affects the food service workers.

Last week, President Trump said—imagine this, a billionaire President—his shutdown, the Trump shutdown, which he proudly, as Commander in Chief, said: “I am proud of this shutdown.” Last week, he said: “This shutdown has a higher purpose than next week’s pay.” Imagine that, a billionaire President, living in this beautiful house paid for by taxpayers and having his estate in Mar-a-Lago, and he would say: “This shutdown,” this Trump shutdown, “has a higher purpose than next week’s pay.”

I wonder if he would tell that to TSA workers, the ones I met in Cleveland, including Aaron Bankston, who told me:

If you’re the only breadwinner in your family, and to have your kids looking up at you, it’s hard to tell them, we don’t have anything to put food on the table, that’s the hard part.

We just have to get us back working. We’re working diligently over here, trying to make sure we’re securing America.

Mr. President, tell the cafeteria workers I talked with there is a higher purpose than their week’s pay because, remember, it is not just Federal employees feeling the pain. There are also these contractors. There are 800,000 Federal employees. We think—we can’t get the number from the government yet—I am not sure the administration wants to tell us these numbers. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of contract workers making \$10, \$12, \$15 an hour—making a little more if they are lucky enough to have a union, but some making as little as \$8 or \$9 or \$10 an hour.

A lot of Americans don’t realize that thousands of janitors and cafeteria workers and security guards are out of work because of the President. You know, it is all kinds of Federal employees. It is people who process tax returns at the IRS. It is people who are helping farmers adjust to the new farm bill we passed proudly—Senators ROBERTS and STABENOW and a bunch of others. It is about people wanting to get a mortgage, and they can’t get it approved at FHA because of this shutdown. It is also people making \$8 and \$10 and \$12 an hour. Unless we do something, these workers will not get the backpay they should get because they are employed by private contractors. They have no way, at \$12 and \$15 an hour—without pay, they have no way of making up their lost hours and lost wages. I am working with a relatively new Minnesota Senator, Ms. SMITH, on legislation to try to come up with a solution to get these workers backpay, the way that workers who are actual Federal employees get backpay. Fundamentally, it comes down to respecting the dignity of work. That means respecting the dignity of work and that these workers make a decent wage with decent benefits.

Missing one paycheck may not seem like a lot to the billionaire President and the multimillionaire Cabinet with their massive investment portfolio.

I will say that again. Missing one 2-week paycheck or two 2-week paychecks or even, if the President gets his way, three 2-week paychecks may not seem like a lot to a billionaire President and a multimillionaire Cabinet with their massive investment portfolios, but it means a whole lot to these people. Missing a paycheck is a big, big deal that the President of the United States clearly either doesn’t understand or doesn’t care about.

The President doesn’t understand that working people can’t just send a letter to creditors saying: Excuse me from paying rent this month or paying my mortgage or paying for my medications. You can’t put groceries or gas in the car with an IOU.

One of those cafeteria workers told me in Arlington: I have to pay rent. I have other bills. I have a college student in community college. He needs help with his books. He said: President Trump, I am asking would you please open the government. Everyone is going through hardship. We really don’t want this wall you want.

I am guessing the President of the United States, the billionaire President, jetting back and forth between the White House and Mar-a-Lago in Florida, will never talk to not just these workers I talked to in Virginia or those TSA employees in Cleveland—I am sure he will not talk to them, but I hope he will talk to some people like them.

He spends his time in his resort, but he doesn’t see them. To him, they are invisible, but MITCH MCCONNELL can see them. MITCH MCCONNELL’s office is down the hall on the right about 100 feet. I have shared on this floor before how lobbyists, during the tax bill, when President Trump and the majority in the Senate and the majority in the House gave a \$1.5 trillion tax cut—and 70 percent of that tax cut went to the richest 1 percent, people like themselves, the President, the Cabinet, many Members of the Senate, many Members of the House. I documented it to show—as I looked out this door and opened these doors, I showed this is the place where the lobbyists go in and out of the majority leader’s office, talking to him about their special interest legislation.

So I ask—right now, Senator MCCONNELL could come out of his office, and he could walk down this hall. I would be happy to open the door for him, if that is not contrary to Senate rules. I would be happy to open the door for him and welcome him. He could right now vote to reopen the government and get this process moving and tell the President of the United States. He also could go to Virginia. He also could go to the airport in Louisville or Cincinnati, and he could listen to their stories, but he doesn’t seem to be listening either because I am guessing if he did, he might be a little more inclined to let us vote to get these workers back on the job.

I am calling on Senator MCCONNELL to come out of that office, to walk

down this hall, and to come here and begin the process of opening the government.

Let’s talk for a minute about what the President said last night. The President continued his record of telling lie after lie after lie after lie, misleading the people he is supposed to serve. Facts matter. So when you hear the President say we need a wall, remember that it is a fact that illegal border crossings are at historic lows. It is not fake news. My wife says if it is fake, it is not news, and if it is news, it is not fake. It is a fact that border crossings are at historic lows.

Another fact, border crossings are down about 80 percent since 2000. Another fact, the President’s wall would do nothing to stop opioids coming into our communities. First, most illegal opioids are seized at legal points of entry, not tracked over some remote area of Texas. Fact, the shutdown makes it harder for Customs and Border Protection to do their jobs intercepting those opioids.

Another fact, last year we passed the INTERDICTION Act. I worked with my colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator MARKEY from Massachusetts on a bipartisan bill to get Customs and Border Protection the screening devices they need to test for opioids. Why would we focus on the President’s vanity project, building this wall? A promise he made—remember his promise? “I will build the wall, and the Mexicans will pay for it.” Well, he is now asking American taxpayers, over time, to pay \$25 or \$30 billion.

Why would we focus on the President’s vanity project instead of getting the agents and technology they need? We can do this with agents, technology, helicopters, and all the things we need to do to protect the border because that is what we want to do. We don’t want this vanity project. We want to protect the border.

Another fact, most undocumented immigrants aren’t committing crimes. In fact, there are 56 percent fewer criminal convictions of undocumented immigrants than of native-born Texans. So a native-born Texan is more likely, percentage-wise, to commit a crime than an undocumented person living in Texas.

Keep in mind the facts of what this shutdown is costing the American people; 800,000 Federal workers are going without a paycheck; 420,000 of them are on the job without pay; thousands of contract workers, custodians, cafeteria workers, janitors not only are not getting a paycheck, but they probably never will for this lost work.

Here is another fact. The President and Senator MCCONNELL could end the shutdown right now. The Senate passed a bill unanimously to fund the government in December. That is a fact. We passed it. It is a fact. It was unanimous. It is a fact. The House passed bills to fund the government last week. It is a fact. Senator MCCONNELL right now could come out of that office, walk

down this hall, and Senator McCONNELL could put those House bills on the floor right now, and we could vote to end this shutdown. We could send them to the President's desk, and if the President is going to continue his vanity project and continue this Trump shutdown and he vetoes it, we have the ability to override it.

The President doesn't tell us what to do. He seems to be telling the Republican majority what to do day after day. I applaud those who stood up to him recently and said they want to open the government, but it is also a fact that this President said: "I am proud to shut down the government."

The Commander in Chief of the United States of America—the Commander in Chief—the top person in this country's government said: "I am proud to shut down the government."

Facts matter. The fact is, President Trump, once again, as he betrayed the General Motors workers in Lordstown, as he betrayed the General Motors suppliers—all the companies that supply the building of the Chevy Cruz—he has betrayed these Federal workers; he has betrayed these contract workers who are making \$10, \$12, and \$15 an hour; and he has betrayed the American worker.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Florida.

S. 1

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, what is before us right now is S. 1. For those who are here today watching or who are at home or will watch this later and are wondering what the Senate is doing, other than coming down here and giving speeches, what we are trying to do is start debate on a bill, on S. 1.

S. 1 is the Senate effort to respond specifically not just to general events that are happening in the Middle East but, in particular, the decision made a few weeks ago that the United States would be leaving Syria and our presence there.

At the time when the decision was made, I told everybody I thought it was a bad idea. A lot of people agreed, and there are a lot of reasons why it was a bad idea. Although I do think it is important anytime we ask the American people to send their young men and women abroad—in the case of Syria, it is about 2,000 special operators working alongside tens of thousands of Kurdish and Syrian democratic forces. Anytime we spend money or send Americans abroad to risk their lives, the American people deserve for us to go to them and justify why it is we should be doing it or continue to do it. That is certainly the case with Syria.

So I don't agree with the decision, but I do think it has given the Senate and those of us who disagree with that decision an opportunity to go out and tell people why it is that it is important. That is a broader topic, and I will have more to say about that in the days to come, but one of the reasons

why it is important is because the U.S. withdrawal from Syria will have a dramatic impact on the security of Israel.

Now, again, anytime we ask the American people to support another country with money or diplomatic support or anything that it might be—weapons—we should justify it. We should never take for granted why it is that it is important that we support that other country.

In the case of Israel, at a time when very few things enjoy bipartisan support, support for Israel has wide bipartisan support in Congress and across the country, and rightfully so. Our support of the State of Israel is founded both on morality and our national interest.

On the issue of morality, the State of Israel is very unique. It was founded for a very specific purpose in the aftermath of the holocaust, in which millions of Jews lost their lives. It was vowed that never again would the Jewish people not have a place to go and seek refuge or live in a place of peace and security. The State of Israel was established to be that homeland for the Jewish people. It is unique in the fact that it was given birth by an international organization. It is unique in the world in that regard.

The second reason we should support Israel is because it is in our national interest. Israel is everything we wish more countries in the Middle East and around the world were. They are a pro-American, free enterprise democracy. I would ask you, for a moment only, to imagine what the world would be like, how much easier our foreign policy would be if there were more countries in that part of the world that were pro-American, free enterprise democracies. We have one, the Jewish State of Israel. That is why we should support it.

From its very birth, Israel has faced threats to its very existence, but I would say today that the threats it faces are the greatest ones it has had to confront in almost a half century. The impetus for much of that threat comes from one place, and that is Iran, a country which almost as a matter of course as a government chants "Death to America" and "Death to Israel" on a regular basis. It is one of the stated purposes of that government, to destroy the State of Israel, but they aren't just words; they are actions.

I have a map of Iran and Israel. Of course, notice that Israel is the tiny little area on this map. At its narrowest point, Israel is 9 miles wide. This is not a large country in terms of the map area. It is unreal how much of the world's attention, both from international organizations and international debates, focuses on this one tiny country, but there it is, the very small nation that you see right there in yellow.

There is Iran. It is, clearly, larger in terms of on the map and in reality. Iran isn't simply a rhetorical enemy of Israel; it is taking action to encircle Israel and to threaten its security.

It begins with engagement in its missile program. Iran is developing and has developed ballistic missiles with a range that reaches every part of Israel. Here is the bottom line: Iran can lodge ballistic missiles that reach any city in Israel right now, which is why their nuclear ambitions are so dangerous.

Imagine that at some point in the future, Iran is able to attach a nuclear warhead to one of those ballistic missiles—a country whose leaders on a regular basis chant "Death to Israel" with a nuclear weapon that can reach Israel. Well, that is a proposition nobody wants to see come about. That is why the Iranian ambition to have nuclear weapons is so dangerous. They already possess that as it is today. But they don't simply directly target Israel; they also—I believe directly—they hide behind surrogates in the region, who do their bidding. These surrogates have for many years been found in southern Lebanon among Hezbollah. We will talk about them in a moment. They are a surrogate that works at the behest of the Iranian Government.

There have been conflicts—in fact, wars—between Israel and Hezbollah in which there have been massive military attacks coming from Lebanon, rocket strikes into Israel and Israel's response. The last one was in the 2005–2006 time period, and it could happen again. In fact, I believe the conditions are ripe for it to happen again. It could happen at any moment for a variety of different reasons that will have to be part of another speech because time doesn't permit. Suffice it to say, it is a dangerous proposition.

How does Hezbollah get this weaponry? They get this weaponry from Iran. It is shipped through Syria. The U.S. disengagement from Syria will make it easier for Iran and the IRGC and Hezbollah to bring those weapons into southern Lebanon to strike at Israel at some point in the future. In addition to that, Iran is also present on the ground in Syria, which, as you see, borders Israel. So not only does Iran help Hezbollah, but Hezbollah and Iran are in Syria, on Israel's very border in the same region in the south, and a U.S. withdrawal will make it easier for Iran to grow their presence there. So now Israel faces a threat from Hezbollah, from southern Lebanon, and a threat from Iran and Hezbollah in Syria.

We also see that the Iranian influence has grown in Iraq. The second leading political movement in the current Iraqi Parliament is a Shia group, directly aligned in Iran, with growing political influence. They want to kick America out of there. Believe me, they want to turn Iraq into another base of operation from which Israel can be targeted.

Down here in Yemen, the Houthis are an agent of Iran. You may say: Well, that is kind of far. It isn't in the sense that those missiles and rockets could reach there as well, but it also allows

them the opportunity to shut off transit here at this chokepoint on the bottom of the Red Sea, which could directly impact, ultimately, the ability for trade and commerce for Israel and for the region writ large.

Obviously, we see a growing Iranian presence in Bahrain and Kuwait.

Suffice it to say that Iran is carrying out an effort to grow its influence and encircle who it views as its enemies—the Sunnis in Saudi Arabia but more than anyone else, the Israelis.

This is not the only threat, by the way, that Israel faces. It also faces growing violence and resistance in the Judea-Samaria region—often called by some the West Bank—and Gaza, where there have been upticks in violence.

I failed to mention that in southern Lebanon, Hezbollah routinely builds tunnels from Lebanon into Israel. The purpose of that is to be able to sneak fighters right into Israel through those tunnels so they can conduct commando raids and kill civilians—not military personnel but civilians.

The threats Israel is facing are growing every single day.

I want to talk specifically for a moment about the missile threat to Israel. Here are the ranges of these rockets. There was an Israel-Hezbollah war. The next one will be far deadlier. It will be far deadlier for a couple of reasons.

The first is that Hezbollah can build these rockets; they no longer need to ship them in. Over the last decade and a half, they have built the capability to construct these rockets themselves.

The second is that they have more of them. That matters because Israel has a very good missile defense system, but you can overwhelm a missile defense system with volume, meaning 100 rockets are launched, and you knock down 99 of them, but 1 of them gets through and hits a population center and kills 10,000 people. Hezbollah now has that capability.

These rockets are also precision-guided. They are not just lobbing them over and they hit what they hit. They can launch precision-guided munitions to target specific areas within Israel. The ranges of these rockets they now possess are stunning. As an example, if you look at this little ring here, it tells you how many seconds it would take from launch to impact, meaning 10 to 25 seconds before they could hit, for example, the area of Nazareth and Tiberias. Moving farther down, you see 35 to 50 seconds. Farther down, around Tel Aviv, 75 seconds. Jerusalem, just south of that is probably another 10 seconds added, 85 seconds. A hundred and twenty seconds. A hundred and fifty-five seconds.

Imagine for a moment that you are visiting Israel or live in Israel or are a student studying there—whatever it might be—and one of these launches comes in, a barrage of 1,000 rockets launched. You literally have 35 to 50 seconds—less than 2 minutes. There is no country in the world that can mobi-

lize people to get out of the way in 2 minutes. These are their population centers. This is the threat that faces them right now, and that is just from Lebanon. Imagine that same capability I just described also existing in Syria. Imagine it all being launched simultaneously from Syria, from Lebanon, and from Iran. Now you begin to see the construct of a plan to destroy this tiny nation and why it is so critical that the United States support them in fighting for their existence. The threat is extraordinary.

There is one more element to it. There is now a global effort called boycott, divestment, and sanctions, BDS. It is designed to wage economic war on Israel—in essence, to pressure companies to boycott Israeli companies and people who do business in Israel until they stop, to pressure investment funds and banks to no longer do investments in anything related to Israel, and to pressure governments around the world to sanction Israel. That is what this effort is about. It is to undermine them economically as well. It is economic warfare and being waged at every level. It is working. People are adopting this around the world, and there are some who advocate for it here. We have recently seen in the news a number of companies that decided not to do business in certain parts of Israel because of the pressure from that movement.

By the way, I would point out that they are not just boycotting the economy; there are people who won't do concerts, and they won't play the Israeli sports teams. They want the Israeli Government kicked out of the international committee for different sports, including soccer—the Olympic committee. They boycott cultural events. They boycott universities. They are pressuring universities to cut ties with any university in Israel over all this. It is an effort to destroy Israel culturally and economically in a way that works in combination with the effort to destroy it physically. It is a very real threat.

We have tried to confront both of these issues in bipartisan legislation. I have up here a chart, and I will talk about it in a moment. Twenty-six States in this country have tried to do something to condemn BDS. I will get to that in a moment before I tell you the “what.”

I told you why it is so important that we stand with Israel and the threats that Israel faces. Now I will describe what this bill does. This bill has four components to it. One deals with the human rights violation in Syria. We will discuss that further, perhaps tomorrow. The second component of this bill deals with Jordan, which is one of the neighbors that Israel has that is actually critical to its security. One of the best things that happened to Israel security was the deal with Jordan and Egypt that allowed them, at their periphery, to have countries that at least recognize them and are not out to destroy them. Jordan faces its own

threats from some of the same actors, by the way. And add ISIS to that.

The other two elements are we took these two bills that have bipartisan support—cosponsored by Republicans and Democrats—we combined them with the other two bills, which also had such support, into one bill. That is S. 1. We viewed it as an opportunity for the Senate and for Congress to weigh in on foreign policy at a time when we believe that all of the threats to Israel that I just described are made worse by the decision to withdraw from Syria. That is the bill that is before us.

Today, I want to talk about the two components that impact Israel directly. The first is basically the United States-Israel Security Assistance Authorization Act. That is a fancy title for a bill that I coauthored with my very good friend and another strong supporter of Israel, Senator CHRIS COONS of Delaware, who sits on the other side of the aisle. Again, I told you this is a bipartisan issue.

This bill has 72 cosponsors here in the Senate. It passed overwhelmingly by a voice vote. We didn't even have to have a rollcall vote. It was just voice-voted out, meaning there was unanimous consent—no one objected—on the 1st of August of last year. It passed in the House, with an amendment, on September 12. Then it was hotlined for a potential voice vote here on October 11, 2018.

What does this bill do? The first thing it does is it lays out a statement of policy. Let me tell you why that is important. People say: Statement of policy words—why do they matter? They matter in the region because one of the things that would encourage Hezbollah or any of Israel's enemies to perhaps attack it is the belief that the United States is no longer as committed to Israel's security as we once were. They could miscalculate. They read these headlines about one or two people in America saying something negative toward Israel, and they think that somehow we are weakening in our resolve. I know that sounds silly to us, but to people involved in that over there, it is not. They read into this, and they miscalculate it. They make errors. A miscalculation here could lead to an all-out war that could cost the lives of thousands of people and potentially lead to the destruction of Israel, along with other nations in the process.

It is important for us to make very clear that our commitment to Israel is unwavering. It is especially important in light of the decision to withdraw from Syria because what a lot of these countries—including Iran—are reading into this is, U.S. commitment to the Middle East is no longer very strong. Not only are they not committed to being involved in the region, they are actually withdrawing any of the assets they could be using to be supportive of their allies in the region.

So these statements of policy are important. What we put in this bill lays out a statement of policy that says:

It shall be the policy of the United States to provide assistance to the Government of Israel in order to support funding for cooperative programs to develop, produce, and procure missile, rocket, projectile, and other defense capabilities to help Israel meet its security needs and to help develop and enhance United States defense capabilities.

What that means is, this is a cooperation. Israel may be developing some of these technologies because they have an immediate need. We would benefit from that technology too. If Israel develops the next generation of missile defense systems, we would use that as well in the case where we were threatened by it. That is that statement of policy.

The bill also authorizes U.S. security assistance in foreign military financing at no less than \$3.3 billion a year for the next decade. That, by the way, is simply the language from a memorandum of understanding that was signed by the Obama administration and Israel. We put that in the statute, and we authorized it.

This is very important. It extends a war reserve stockpile authority and extends loan guarantees to Israel through 2023. Israel has never defaulted on a U.S.-backed loan guarantee, and this program helps provide rainy-day insurance on Israel's stability given the many threats it is facing.

It authorizes the President to transfer precision-guided munitions and related defense articles and services to Israel as necessary for legitimate self-defense. That means this weaponry wouldn't be sent, but it would be put on reserve status—assuming it doesn't impact our readiness—and it would be made available to Israel in case a war broke out and their reserves were quickly depleted. If they start running out of rockets, munitions, and defense apparatus, the United States has set aside weaponry that we are ready to rapidly send to them so they can defend themselves. They pay for this. But at least they know it is sitting there. We don't have to scramble to find it, it takes 2 weeks to get there, and by then, the war is over.

It has other requirements. It expresses the sense of Congress that the President should prescribe procedures for rapidly acquiring and deploying what we need to support production of these precision-guided munitions for our U.S. counterterrorism mission.

It requires the President to report no later than 120 days to the appropriate congressional committees on Israel's eligibility for the strategic trade authorization exception to certain export control licensing, including the reasons as to why Israel has not yet been included in the list of countries eligible for the strategic trade authorization exception.

This one is also very critical. This is a new threat that is emerging. It authorizes the President to enter into a cooperative agreement—meaning it benefits them and us—to counter unmanned aerial vehicles and the threat they pose. The reason for that is that

on February 10 of last year, an Iranian drone was shot down by Israel. Everyone has every reason to believe that these unmanned aerial vehicles are the next threat that will be deployed both in the battlefield and potentially by terrorists. We would work with Israel, which faces an immediate threat, to develop counters to that. Today, we don't have good counters to that.

Above all else, it makes one more very clear policy statement that has been the linchpin of our support for Israel, which is that it is the policy of the United States to ensure that Israel maintains its ability to counter and defeat any credible conventional military or emerging threat from any state or possible coalition of states or from nonstate actors while sustaining minimal damage and casualties through the use of superior military means possessed in sufficient quantities, including weapons, command, control, communication, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities that in their technical characteristics are superior in capability to those of such other individual or possible coalition states or nonstate actors.

Here is what this means: It is the policy of the United States to ensure that Israel's weapons and systems are better than anyone else's in the region. Whatever anybody else has we will sell to Israel and allow it to access and acquire something better so that it will always have an advantage. If anyone in that region believes it could beat Israel in a war, one will try to beat Israel in a war. That was the history from its very birth, and that was the lesson of 1967 and the lesson of 1973. We don't want that to happen again. That is what this bill does. That is why it has so much support. That is why it is so important for us to move to debate on this issue.

It also tackles this economic warfare. What is included in this is a bill we filed last year with Senator MANCHIN, called the Combating BDS Act. By the way, last year, the Banking chairman, Senator CRAPO of Idaho, and the ranking member, Senator BROWN of Ohio, discharged this bill from their committee, and they didn't even require a hearing. They did it late last year after running it by all of their members, and we tried to pass it in the Senate by a voice vote but were unable to because of one Senator who blocked it.

Let me start by thanking Senators CRAPO and BROWN for working hard to advance this bill last year, as well as for coauthoring with me last year the new Hezbollah sanctions law, known as the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2018. We strengthened the sanctions on Hezbollah that we had passed in the 2 years previous.

First of all, let me tell you what it doesn't do. It does not outlaw BDS. If you are an American company and you want to boycott or divest from Israel, this doesn't make it illegal. It doesn't stop you from doing it. It only says

that if there is some city or county or State in this country that wants to support Israel, it has a right to say it is not going to buy services or goods from any company that is boycotting or divesting from Israel. That is all it does. It gives cities and counties like these—26 States—the opportunity to have their elected officials who respond to the people of those States or cities or counties who elected them to make decisions that they are not going to do business with people who don't do business with Israel and boycott Israel. In essence, it allows us to boycott the boycotters.

Some say that it is an infringement on the First Amendment. First, I will tell you that the First Amendment protects speech and actions that function in the form of speech. This is not an effort to silence speech nor is this an effort, by the way, to defeat an effort per se. It is an effort to defend the right to counterspeak. The First Amendment is a two-way street. You have a right to express your views on something, but others have a right to respond. You have a right to boycott a country, and people have a right to boycott you. That is what this law allows them to do. It is that simple.

By the way, this is not some domestic debate. They are not trying to influence some law that we are passing here with BDS. They are not trying to influence your opinions on a topic. They are trying to influence the foreign policy of another country. This is not traditional free speech. The courts have weighed in on this in the past, and the courts have given Congress and the executive branch extraordinary discretion on the setting of foreign policy. When a company weighs in on BDS, it is not trying to influence a domestic debate or a topic of opinion here in the U.S. political system; it is trying to punish a nation-state so that the state changes its policies in another country.

There is an open question about whether the First Amendment even covers that. The bill basically says, notwithstanding whatever is in the bill, nothing in the bill shall be construed to invade or to hurt anyone's First Amendment rights. So anyone who hides behind the idea that this is designed to silence speech isn't being truthful.

This does not outlaw BDS. If you want to boycott or divest from Israel, you can. It is legal. We are not outlawing that as that would be an infringement. All we are saying is, if you are going to boycott Israel, those who support Israel will have a right to boycott you. That includes cities and counties and States that don't want to buy stuff from you. That is what this bill does. That is why it enjoys this broad bipartisan support.

Some have asked me to take it out of this bill and have said it is the reason we are not moving to it. At least, that is what I heard earlier. Now there is another reason. It is absurd. Vote against it and then justify it, but if you

are trying to shield the boycotters, that is the de facto support of BDS, in my opinion, and I think it is important for us to pass it.

I emphasize again that this was not overly controversial 2 weeks ago. Look at the list of people who supported this bill last year: the majority leader, the minority leader, the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Finance Committee chairman, and the ranking member of the Finance Committee. Democratic and Republican leaders on multiple committees and at the very top of this Chamber support this bill. Yet, somehow, we can't even proceed to debate on this bill.

You may say, "Well, wait until the shutdown is over," because that is the argument that is being used now—that we shouldn't move to anything until we deal with the shutdown. I don't like the shutdown. I hope it ends tonight or tomorrow morning. Yet this is not just any other issue. There is a credible argument to be made that there is a time sensitivity to this because the enemies of Israel aren't sitting around, waiting. This could happen at any moment. These aren't the kinds of things that build up. Hezbollah's desire to destroy Israel is longstanding, and what they choose to do about it will not wait for the U.S. Senate to deal with other topics. This is an immediate threat. It is right before us, and it deserves our immediate reaction.

This could rapidly escalate, but I am not going to take up another 30 minutes to describe all of the scenarios under which that could happen. Yet I will give you one that is not out of the realm of possibility. Now that they know that the United States is going to be withdrawing from Syria, the Israelis could decide—and, I believe, rightfully so—that for their own defense, they will need to start attacking even more inside Syria. Regarding those supply lanes that Iran is using, every time they see a truck with rockets on it, they are going to blow up the truck. Every time they see IRGC or Hezbollah militias forming anywhere near their border, they are going to hit them. They are now going to step up those attacks because we are not there anymore. Iran is going to fill that void, so they are going to have to step up their attacks.

At some point, Iran and/or Hezbollah is going to respond to those stepped-up attacks with attacks of its own, at which point Israel is going to respond with even bigger attacks. Then the cycle of escalation will begin. Then very quickly—before you know it—in this region, we could have a shooting war, not a war of words and not a vote at the U.N., but rockets and missiles being fired at one another from Lebanon or from Syria into Israel, with Israel's responding back into Syria and Israel's responding back into Lebanon. In fact, Israel has said that all of Lebanon is on the target list since now

Hezbollah and the current President of Lebanon have created a political alliance. You also have these other countries running around inside Syria, including the Russians now and the Turks up to the north. There is the potential that their troops would get caught in the firefight in their eliciting a response back to Israel. Before you know it, we could have a multistate, multiparty, all-out war in the Middle East. The possibility of that happening is not farfetched.

I say this to you today with no pleasure. There will be another Israel-Hezbollah war. It is just a matter of time. Yet the next one will be far more deadly. It is incumbent upon us to do what we can. There are things we cannot do, and there are things we can do. It is incumbent upon us to prolong it and to prevent it for as long as possible. One of the things we can do to help prevent that or to extend the time before that happens is to make it very clear to Hezbollah and Iran and everyone else that if they take on Israel, we will support Israel. That is what this bill is designed to do. It is not just to send that message but to put in place that reality.

Given the tinderbox that is the Middle East and given the unpredictability of the various actors involved, particularly those that hate Israel, why would we not move immediately to address something like that? Why are we not capable of voting on something that will probably get 80 votes here and still deal with the government shutdown?

The last time we had a government shutdown, we were still voting on bills that had nothing to do with the government shutdown. When the other party was in charge, we were doing that. There is no precedent for doing it. I believe that it is possible for us to do both, and that is what we should do. This isn't tax reform or healthcare reform. This is something that is urgent and immediate and requires our attention because of the unpredictability of foreign events today and because of the unpredictability of this part of the world.

I know, at some point here soon, that the leader will bring up for a second time a vote on the motion to proceed. It is not even a vote on the bill. It is a motion to begin debate on this bill. Nothing else is going on around here. Let them continue to meet and have a dialogue and talk about how to get us out of this shutdown. I hope we do. I hope that happens. Yet don't shut down the Senate, particularly on a topic of this importance, because these events will not wait for us. It is important for us to act.

Please don't go around asking people to stand up to this administration's foreign policies that we don't agree with—when we at least offer a counter or something to diminish its negative impacts—and respond with obstruction and not just obstruction because of policy but with obstruction in order to make a political point or to avoid a

vote that three or four Senators might not want to take. I don't think that makes a lot of sense.

I think, when it comes to the issues of national security and foreign policy, we should try, to the extent possible, to remove them from the daily grind and back-and-forth of American politics because the repercussions are dramatic. That is the one thing that makes national security and foreign policy different from domestic policy. You can always go back and change a bad tax law. You can always go back and change a bad healthcare law. You can always go back and make changes to a bad banking law. You can't undo history. You can't undo wars once they have started. You can't undo carnage once it has occurred. Foreign policy is often irreversible, and once mistakes are made, you have to do the best you can with the hand you have been dealt.

That is why I hope that on this one, we stop playing games, that we get on this bill, and that we pass it so that even as this debate about the shutdown continues, we will make clear to the world and we will make clear to her enemies that we stand with Israel. We always have and we always will across party lines. We may bicker and fight about many things, but when it comes to the support of Israel, we are united—House and Senate Republicans and Democrats and the White House—in the support of our strongest ally in the region and of one of our strongest allies in the entire world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss President Trump's ongoing shutdown of the Federal Government—how we got here, the impact on the people of my State, and how we can make some progress.

It is past time for the President to stop holding the American people for ransom through this government shutdown. It is past time to stop the misinformation campaign and to stop making unwarranted demands for the ill use of American taxpayers' dollars. The President needs to open the government.

The Senate did its work on the budget. We have bipartisan, compromise bills that are ready for the President's signature. Chairman COLLINS and I worked together, on a bipartisan basis, to develop the fiscal year 2019 Transportation-HUD bill, which was reported out of committee unanimously. Our bill was then approved by the full Senate as part of a package that included three other bipartisan appropriations bills—Agriculture, Financial Services, and the Interior. Together, these bills passed by a veto-proof margin of 92 to 6.

I am very proud of the work that Chairman COLLINS did and that I was able to assist with during this process to provide an additional \$10 billion to rebuild our roads, our bridges, and our

airports and to develop new affordable housing opportunities to more than 5 million low-income Americans who strive to make ends meet. These investments will grow our economy, spur job creation, and improve communities across America.

The T-HUD bill—on an issue that both Chairman COLLINS and I care deeply about—will continue to make a major commitment to address homelessness among youth, veterans, and survivors of domestic violence. We are making real progress through the HUD-VASH Program, which has brought down homelessness among veterans by 49 percent since 2010 and is helping 64 communities in 3 States effectively end homelessness among veterans.

In September, a Senate-House conference committee that I served on had essentially reached an agreement on a final version of these four bills. They could have been passed and signed into law by the start of the fiscal year last October 1. It would have been a victory for the American people—both for the smart investments these bills would make and for the restoration of good government and regular order, which Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY have both made it a priority to achieve. Instead, a final agreement was slow-walked and stalled by the House leadership and then the White House in order to give the President greater leverage for the shutdown he had been angling for over many months.

Here we are, 3 months into the fiscal year and 3 weeks into a shutdown, and 800,000 Federal employees have either been furloughed or forced to work without pay. Thousands of Federal contract employees are also out of work and may never be compensated. Trash is piling up at national parks, and damage is being reported. Employers can't access the government's E-Verify system to assure that they are hiring legal residents. Soon, the shutdown may prevent HUD from renewing project-based rental agreements. Press reports indicate that the shutdown is causing States to scale back in awarding highway and transit contracts.

Starting as soon as this Friday, many Federal district courts will start feeling the Federal shutdown pinch more acutely, with just skeleton crews or just a few people working without pay, making it harder for Americans and businesses to get their day in court.

Like everyone else, Federal employees—from Coast Guard officers and enlisted personnel to FBI agents, to air traffic controllers—have rent, mortgages, student loans, childcare, and healthcare bills to pay. Many work paycheck to paycheck.

The President has said that he is willing to continue this shutdown for months or even years without a care about the effect it will have on their lives. Indeed, during his speech last night, the President didn't even mention these Federal employees. In Congress, we hear their stories.

On Monday, air traffic controllers from T.F. Green Airport visited my office. They explained that this shutdown not only creates financial hardships for them, it also clogs the pipeline for the hiring and training of new controllers who are desperately needed to replace those who are eligible for retirement.

I am hearing from other constituents too. A USDA meat inspector from Chepachet, RI, sent me an email over the holidays saying:

I'm one of the Federal employees that will be impacted by the government shutdown/imasse. . . . I'm required to report to work without pay for the duration. I have 3 children under 5 and a stay-at-home husband, with no contingency plan for lack of pay, especially during the holiday season. I realize it's Christmas, and you all have families too. The holidays are stressful enough without additional financial stress.

I hope the President will act and reopen the Department of Agriculture, the FDA, and other Agencies that keep our food and medicine safe.

A Coast Guard lieutenant from Westerly, RI, also wrote me to say:

I respectfully implore you to represent the needs and values of servicemembers such as myself, as well as the hard-working Coast Guard civilians who work alongside me. During the shutdown, our missions are stunted and our dedication is disrespected. As the only household income and as I continue to fulfill my commitment to active duty service, my ability to meet financial obligations for myself and my two young children is at great risk if the shutdown continues. Likewise, the government is not living up to its end of the contract made with my crew of both active duty and civilian members. Please share this plea with your fellow Congress members.

Lieutenant, thank you for your service and for the additional sacrifice you and your colleagues are making today.

As we think about border security, let's remember the important job the Coast Guard is doing to protect our border, particularly to prevent illegal drugs from entering the United States. In 2017 alone, the Coast Guard seized illegal drugs valued at \$6.6 billion wholesale and detained 708 suspected smugglers for prosecution. So it is interesting to have the President talk about drug smugglers coming across our Mexican border while the Coast Guard is out there, unpaid, protecting us on all of the seas and oceans that abut the United States.

It is not just Federal employees. An executive at a small shipyard in North Kingstown, RI, wrote to me this week to say:

We do a great deal of work for the U.S. Coast Guard, and for the last three weeks, we have not been paid. We currently have about a half a million dollars due with an additional \$200,000 going in for review and payment in the next week or so. This situation is beginning to hinder our ability to pay our vendors, and it's created a cash flow deficiency that, if not resolved soon, will be difficult and costly to manage. Please feel free to share this message with whoever needs to hear about this.

This is a small business in Rhode Island, repairing ships for our Coast

Guard, that is facing financial distress—in fact, perhaps, disaster. Those are the people who are being harmed by this shutdown.

Certainly, I hear this message, and I know my colleagues are listening, but for whatever reason, the President doesn't seem to be listening.

So how does this get resolved? Democrats have offered several paths forward, but now the President—the person who caused this shutdown, who proudly declared on television he would take full credit for it—needs to commit to reopening the government without precondition.

I know that many people say: Why can't you just make a deal with the President? Unfortunately, the President can't stick to basic facts, numbers, or a bargain.

Originally, Mexico was going to pay for his border wall. Then he decided that American taxpayers should pay for it, so he asked Congress for \$1.6 billion to build 65 miles of wall. Last Sunday, his request became \$5.7 billion for more than 230 miles of wall. By Monday, he was considering declaring a national emergency and using national defense dollars without congressional approval.

To the idea that the President would use defense dollars to build a border wall, let me say that his proposed wall has no core defense function. We are not at war with Mexico.

In fact, the Pentagon's most recent national defense strategy doesn't mention the southern border as a national defense priority. Meanwhile, the Pentagon has billions of dollars in infrastructure backlogs, ranging from military construction projects for new missions to deferred maintenance in facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization. There is no credible argument that a border wall takes priority over any of these.

Of course, the President doesn't have a real plan for building the border wall. In July, the Government Accountability Office warned that the Trump administration's approach increased risks that the wall—in their words—"will cost more than projected, take longer than planned, or not fully perform as expected." Is there any wonder congressional GOP leaders rejected his wall when they controlled every branch of government in the last 2 years?

The President has not been honest with the American people. He hasn't even been straight with members of his administration or Members of his own party in Congress, who are often hung out to dry.

In fact, 2 days before the shutdown, the then-Senate majority whip told CNN, after a meeting with Vice President PENCE, that the President would sign a clean continuing resolution to keep the government open until after Christmas. Less than 24 hours later, that position was reversed by a Presidential tweet.

Even when the President makes a deal, he has trouble keeping it, especially when he is under criticism from

rightwing talk radio and TV personalities. After negotiating overall funding levels for defense and nondefense spending last year, the President nearly vetoed the final 2018 Omnibus appropriations bill because he was criticized for the size and scope of the bill. Secretary Mattis had to be summoned to the White House to explain how important the bill was to the Pentagon before the President grudgingly agreed to sign it.

Now there is no Secretary Mattis or anyone of his stature to give the President good counsel. If the President remains implacable about his wall, it will be up to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with Democrats to pass the bipartisan bills we have already agreed on together and reopen the government.

I hope they do so, and soon, as the lives of our constituents and the health and businesses of our States are at stake.

The answer we have to give is not to the President. The answer is to that young woman working every day without pay to protect the American public by inspecting foods that we eat. The answer we have to give is to that young Coast Guard officer who is working every day, trying to pay for and to afford things for a young family without being paid. The only answer we can give them is that we are opening up this government immediately.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

"ENOURA MARU" ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, today, we remember the 400 American and Allied prisoners of war who died 74 years ago from friendly fire aboard the Japanese hell ship *Enoura Maru* docked in Takeo Harbor, Formosa—modern-day Taiwan.

Among the dead were men who left their homes in America, Australia, Canada, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, and Czechoslovakia to fight an enemy they did not know, in places few of them had heard of, all in pursuit of a common cause: freedom, justice, and equality. These heroes were part of the infamous 45-day odyssey of the last transport of prisoners of war from the Philippines to Japan—captive since the American territory fell to Imperial Japan in the spring of 1942 after fighting to defend the Philippines.

On the morning of January 9, 1945, dive bombers from the USS *Hornet* at-

tacked the unmarked freighter holding 1,300 prisoners of war docked in the Japanese colony's harbor. Two hundred died instantly. Nearly everyone else was wounded. For 2 days, the men were left in the floating wreckage before the Japanese permitted the dead to be removed. Their remains were buried ashore in mass graves.

After the war, the 400 victims of the bombing of the *Enoura Maru* were exhumed and eventually brought to the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Hawaii. They rest in 20 mass graves marked only as "Unknowns January 9, 1945." Their families did not learn the final fate of their loved ones until 2001.

This past August, we remembered these brave men with a memorial stone on the Memorial Walk at the Cemetery honoring the prisoners of war aboard the hell ship *Enoura Maru*. The American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor Memorial Society, an organization that represents the American prisoners of war of Imperial Japan and their families, organized the commemoration in Hawaii.

That memorial stone is a monument to their courage, suffering, and sacrifice. It commemorates their tragic death 74 years ago and marks their final return home. Let that stone and our remembrance of the prisoners of war on the *Enoura Maru* remind us of our sacred commitment to veterans of all eras to "never forget." May they rest in peace.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DICK TRAMMEL

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to acknowledge the remarkable career and service of a man who has played an instrumental role in the growth and development of northwest Arkansas over the last four decades.

Dick Trammel, a pillar of the community and a leader who has been involved in almost everything positive that has happened in and around my hometown of Rogers, AR, has concluded his service at Arvest Bank after 43 years. He is also ending a 10-year term on the Arkansas Highway Commission this month.

Dick is a homegrown Arkansan. A native of Pocahontas, he attended the University of Arkansas where he was a cheerleader for the Hogs football team and earned a bachelor of science degree in business administration in 1960. After graduation, Dick returned home to work in the cotton gin and grain elevator business and became an active member and leader in Pocahontas and Randolph County.

As we all now know, the 1960s saw the founding of retail giant Walmart by Sam Walton. As Walmart was headquartered in Bentonville, Sam was able to entice Dick to relocate to the region and join First National Bank & Trust Company in Rogers in 1975. First

National Bank eventually became part of Arvest Bank and Dick worked for the company for over four decades, retiring as executive vice president, member of the board of directors and board secretary of Arvest Bank, Rogers.

While enjoying a successful career at Arvest, Dick also played an outsized role in northwest Arkansas. He served as president and board member of the Rogers-Lowell Area Chamber of Commerce, was a board member at a local United Way, founded the Single Parent Scholarship Fund in Benton County, was a charter member of the Northwest Arkansas Community College Board of Trustees, and served on the Rogers Youth Center Board of Directors, among so many other philanthropic and civic endeavors.

He is also a board member of the U.S. Marshals Museum Foundation which is incredibly meaningful given the importance of the Marshals Service to the region and the work we have done to help make the U.S. Marshals Museum in Fort Smith a reality. We worked together not only in that capacity, but in many other ways to help the region grow as Dick has spent the last 10 years on our State's highway commission following his appointment to the panel by former Governor Mike Beebe in 2009.

Just recently it was announced that, through many years of persistent work between members of Congress from Arkansas and Missouri and the respective legislatures and State government agencies in both States, that a multi-million-dollar grant has been secured to complete the Bella Vista Bypass on Interstate 49. Dick and his colleagues on the highway commission understood just how important this was for the region and worked hand-in-hand with the congressional delegation to reach this outcome.

As Dick's service at Arvest and on the Arkansas Highway Commission comes to a close, it is only fitting to recognize his enormous impact on a region in Arkansas that has experienced so much growth and transformation throughout his career. Throughout all this change, Dick Trammel has remained a constant source of stability, leadership, and willingness to do whatever it takes to improve the quality of life for everyone in the community.

When my brother and I moved to Rogers to establish a medical practice in 1977, Dick was one of the first people we met. During that time and over the decades that have followed, he has been a steadfast friend and mentor. I greatly admire and appreciate his many contributions to a place we both love and have served in different capacities over the years.

I wish Dick and his wife Nancy well as he begins a well-deserved retirement. He has always been dedicated to helping people, and his lengthy career has demonstrated that commitment many times over. I am grateful to Dick and his entire family for the way they

have served and led. Because of his efforts, northwest Arkansas is in a much better place today than we he first called it home.●

TRIBUTE TO URBAN RAHOI

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I honor an Alaska legend, Urban Rahoi, on the occasion of his 100th birthday, which occurred on Monday, January 6, 2019. Now, my colleagues might wonder, what the heck is an Urban Rahoi?

To his admirers throughout the State of Alaska, the question is more appropriately stated: What is Urban Rahoi not?

Urban is a World War II veteran, an Alaska pioneer, a homesteader, a lodge owner, a legendary hunting guide, an aviator, a snowmobiler, an entrepreneur, and a statesman. They call him “Urban Legend—kind of an odd play on words because “urban legends” are supposed to be false, but you will not find a more direct and honest guy than Urban Rahoi.

He has been flying for more than 80 years and has survived three plane crashes with barely a bruise. That earned Urban a reputation of being somewhat indestructible. That reputation has only strengthened over the years.

In 2016, Urban was out at his remote lodge on an inholding in the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. He woke up at 6 a.m. one morning with a “difficult to describe feeling.” He felt something was just wrong and needed to get out of there. Urban was 97 years old at the time.

Now, most 97-year-olds who wake up to these feelings would likely call 911—not Urban. He gets in his plane and flies off from the lodge to Tok. Then he gets in a truck to begin a 202-mile drive to Fairbanks. He stops for breakfast, drops by a friend’s cabin for lunch and storytelling along the way, goes home for a half hour, and then drives over to Fairbanks Memorial Hospital. It turns out Urban had suffered a stroke, albeit a minor one in his estimation.

Urban is fond of saying: “In my dictionary, two words don’t exist: can’t and impossible.” So he wasn’t about to let a little stroke stop him. Following his release from the hospital, Urban put in long hours in physical therapy. He was reportedly grumpy about missing fall hunting, but he was looking forward to returning to flying and participating in the Tired Iron snowmachine race.

The Tired Iron race is a fundraiser for the Boy Scouts that features racers in relatively ancient snowmachines, or what people in the lower 48 would call snowmobiles. Urban races a 1965 vintage Polaris Mustang. He is known to quip that the iron may be tired, but he isn’t. True to form, Urban won the 2017 Tired Iron, months after his stroke. Come to think of it, he won the 2018 Tired Iron as well.

Just as I said, “indestructible.”

Urban Rahoi was originally from Iron Mountain. He learned to fly in 1934, making his first solo flight at age 15, and joined the Air Force in 1942, where he flew B-17s during World War II. After the war, Urban attended Michigan Technological Institute for 18 months. Restless, he began flying in Alaska and soon packed up his wife Vi, their four dogs, and a pile of gear into his three-passenger Super Cruiser, flying north to Fairbanks. That was in 1947, a dozen years before statehood.

He was one of the founding partners of Interior Airways, which at one point was one of the largest operators of C-130 cargo planes in the world. He remained active in the Air Force Reserve in Alaska and founded his own air service, which enabled him to get back to his homestead on the Tanana River every night. A real estate developer, as well, he developed the Lakeview Terrace subdivision in South Fairbanks.

Urban holds Alaska State Guide license No. 1, issued shortly after statehood, but he began guiding from his Ptarmigan Lake Lodge even before Alaska statehood and remains a master sheep hunter today.

My family has many stories from hunts with Urban, and all end with how Urban kicked their butts as he hiked up and down the mountain, packing more than his share. Urban’s energy humbled the strongest hunter, regardless of age.

Urban is also a citizen-statesman. He served on the Fairbanks North Star Borough Assembly and has run for the Alaska Legislature several times. He remains active in the realm of game policy.

In recent years, Urban has been working on a bucket list item: flying vintage planes. He flew the B-17G Yankee Lady out of the Yankee Air Museum in Ypsilanti, MI, when he was 94. In 2015, he wanted to fly a B-17 over the National Mall in commemoration of VE Day. Despite my efforts to help him gain permission to fly, he ended up a passenger because the government wouldn’t let him fly in restricted airspace. They clearly didn’t know my friend’s skill as an aviator.

During a visit to Eielson Air Force Base in 2016, Urban told his hosts that he lives by a simple philosophy: “Be happy with what you do and if you aren’t happy, go find something you’ll be happy with.” By all accounts, Urban has enjoyed a happy and successful life following that philosophy.

It is with great pleasure that I honor my friend Urban Rahoi in the U.S. Senate. On behalf of my colleagues, I extend Urban best wishes for what I know will continue to be an adventurous future.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:20 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 128. An act to clarify the primary functions and duties of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 227. An act to amend the Small Business Act to specify what credit is given for certain subcontractors and to provide a dispute process for non-payment to subcontractors, and for other purposes.

H.R. 251. An act to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 259. An act to extend the Medicaid Money Follows the Person Rebalancing demonstration, to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, and for other purposes.

H.R. 269. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved drug application, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4 of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Mr. Evans of Pennsylvania.

At 5:36 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 264. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 227. An act to amend the Small Business Act to specify what credit is given for certain subcontractors and to provide a dispute process for non-payment to subcontractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 47. A bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 251. An act to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 264. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

H.R. 269. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved drug application, and for other purposes.

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-21. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-22. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Submission of Summary Subcontract Reports" ((RIN0750-AJ42) (DFARS Case 2017-D005)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-23. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Restrictions on Acquisitions from Foreign Sources" ((RIN0750-AJ22) (DFARS Case 2017-D011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-24. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Electronic Submission and Processing of Payment Requests and Receiving Reports" ((RIN0750-AJ44) (DFARS Case 2016-D032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-25. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Modification of the Limits on Single-Source Task or Delivery Order

Contracts" ((RIN0750-AK21) (DFARS Case 2018-D060)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-26. A communication from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Foreign Commercial Satellite Services and Certain Items on the Commerce Control List" ((RIN0750-AJ82) (DFARS Case 2018-D020)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-27. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-28. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-29. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-30. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Regulation A" ((RIN3235-AM42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-31. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Warranty Requirements for Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Single-Family Mortgage Insurance: Removal of the Ten-Year Protection Plan Requirements" ((RIN2502-AJ40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-32. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility; North Carolina; Camden County, Unincorporated Areas et al." ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-33. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rule 610T—Transaction Fee Pilot" ((RIN3235-0761) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-34. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applications by Security-Based Swap Dealers or Major Security-Based Swap Participants for Statutorily Disqualified Associated Persons to Effect or

be Involved in Effecting Security-Based Swaps" ((RIN3235-AL76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-35. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program Reforms" ((RIN0720-AB75) received on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-36. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties" (10 CFR Parts 207, 218, 429, 431, 490, 501, 601, 820, 824, 851, 1013, 1017, and 1050) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-37. A communication from the Director of Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-38. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluations of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-564, Revision 2, 'Safety Limit MCPR' Using the Consolidated Line Item Improvement Process" ((NUREG-1433 and 1434) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-39. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Revised Model Safety Evaluation of Traveler TSTF-505, Revision 2, 'Provide Risk-Informed Extended Completion Times, RITSTF Initiative 4B'" ((NUREG-1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, and 1434) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-40. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-563, Revision 0, 'Revise Instrument Testing Definitions to Incorporate the Surveillance Frequency Control Program'" ((NUREG-1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, and 2194) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-41. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to the deployment of U.S. forces to support the security of U.S. personnel and our Embassy in The Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-42. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying

Benefits” (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-43. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age” (29 CFR Part 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-44. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations” (21 CFR Part 101) (Docket No. FDA-2000-N-0011) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-45. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Listing of Color Additives Subject to Certification; D&C Yellow No. 8; Confirmation of Effective Date” (21 CFR Part 74) (Docket No. FDA-2017-C-2902) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-46. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Food Labeling; Revision of the Nutrition and Supplement Facts Labels; Technical Amendments” (21 CFR Part 101) (Docket No. FDA-2012-N-1210) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-47. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medical Device Classification Procedures; Incorporating Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act Procedures” (RIN0910-AH75) (Docket No. FDA-2013-N-1529) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-48. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Financial Report for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-49. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Rescinding Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Regulation (HSAR) Clause 3052.219-70, Small Business Subcontracting Plan Reporting (HSAR Case 2017-001)” (RIN1601-AA83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-50. A communication from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Loan Guaranty: Revisions to VA-Guaranteed or Insured Cash-out Home Refinance Loans” (RIN2900-AQ42) received in the Office

of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-51. A communication from the Broadband Division Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Use of Spectrum Bands Above 24 GHz for Mobile Radio Services” ((GN Docket No. 14-177) (FCC 18-180)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-52. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Connect America Fund” ((WC Docket Nos. 10-90, 14-58, and 07-135) (FCC 18-176)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-53. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Television Broadcasting Services; Morehead and Richmond, Kentucky” (MB Docket No. 18-320) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-54. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Parts 0, 1, 5, 73, and 74 of the Commission’s Rules Regarding Posting of Station Licenses and Related Information” and “Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative” (MB Docket Nos. 18-121 and 17-105) (FCC 18-174) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-55. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expansion of the Arroyo Seco Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AC36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-56. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expansion of the Monticello Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AC37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-57. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Van Duzer Corridor Viticultural Area and Clarification of the Eola-Amity Hill Viticultural Area Boundary Description” (RIN1513-AC39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-1. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio urging the United States Congress to enact

bills advancing the development of an Appalachian storage hub; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 21

Whereas, The Appalachian region, including parts of Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and all of West Virginia, contains world class supplies of natural gas and natural gas liquids (NGL) that contribute to the country’s energy dominance; and

Whereas, Harnessing those supplies by constructing an Appalachian storage hub involves major investments in infrastructure, including storage caverns and pipelines, and implementation of a significant jobs program for the residents of the Appalachian region; and

Whereas, Natural gas liquids are the major feedstock of the chemical industry and the region contains enough feedstock to attract \$35 billion in new chemical and plastics industry investment. Chemical and plastic industry investments of this scale could create 100,000 new jobs, \$28 billion in new economic output, more than \$6 billion in annual payroll, and nearly \$3 billion a year in new federal, state, and local tax revenue; and

Whereas, Enactment of the federal “Appalachian Energy and Manufacturing Revitalization Act” would improve the infrastructure permitting process by directing the Secretaries of Energy and Commerce to approve projects related to the Appalachian storage hub, identify the lead federal and state agency liaisons, and coordinate with them on designating the project; and

Whereas, The bill directs the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to consider relevant licenses and permits for the requisite pipeline infrastructure, and then requires the other federal agencies to complete consideration of their respective permits within 60 days of the completion of the FERC licensing or have their jurisdictional permits deemed approved; and

Whereas, In addition to the “Appalachian Energy and Manufacturing Revitalization Act,” the “Capitalizing American Storage Potential Act” would make a regional NGL storage hub eligible for the Department of Energy’s successful Title XVII loan guarantee program, and the “Appalachian Ethane Storage Hub Study Act of 2017” would help assess the feasibility and potential benefits of establishing a subterranean ethane storage and distribution hub in central Appalachia; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the 132nd General Assembly of the State of Ohio, urge the Congress of the United States to enact bills advancing the development of an Appalachian storage hub, including all of the following:

The “Appalachian Energy and Manufacturing Revitalization Act of 2017”;

The “Capitalizing American Storage Potential Act”;

The “Appalachian Ethane Storage Hub Study Act of 2017”;

and be it further *Resolved*, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, each member of the Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania Congressional delegations, and the news media of Ohio.

POM-2. A resolution adopted by the Town Council of Durham, New Hampshire, calling on the United States Congress to lead a global effort to prevent nuclear war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-3. A petition from a citizen of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico requesting

that the government of the United States exempt Puerto Rico from the regulations of the Jones Act, also known in Puerto Rico as the Cabotage Act, to allow foreign-flag ships to bring goods to the country; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 60. A bill to withdraw certain National Forest System land in the Emigrant Crevice area located in the Custer Gallatin National Forest, Park County, Montana, from the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 61. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the personal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 62. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate fair prescription drug prices under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 63. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee on Budget and Appropriations Process Reform; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 64. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 65. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require Federal Reserve banks to interview at least one individual reflective of gender diversity and one individual reflective of racial or ethnic diversity when appointing Federal Reserve bank presidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr.

REED, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 66. A bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 67. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 68. A bill to require the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission to publish an annual report on the estimated impact in each State of the Medicaid expansion added by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, including the estimated impact that adopting such expansion would have in States that have not expanded their Medicaid coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 69. A bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 70. A bill to establish the Medgar and Myrlie Evers Home National Monument in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 71. A bill to ensure independent investigations and judicial review of the removal of a special counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 72. A bill to suspend the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of Federal employees and contractors during a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 12. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth

Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 13. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, a bill 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.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill making continuing appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations act expires prior to the enactment of a new appropriations act.

S. 24

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 24, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. 47

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 47, a bill to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 66. A bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that prohibits the sale, transfer, manufacture, and importation of assault weapons.

I will keep doing this every Congress. This legislation must constantly be before us until Republicans finally decide to join me in the effort to stop mass shootings. This legislation is not perfect. But it is part of the solution. We must start with reducing the supply of the weapons of war that are used to take the lives of our loved ones.

These last years have seen some of the worst gun-violence tragedies in our Nation's history. For example, on October 1, 2017, in Las Vegas, Nevada, a gunman opened fire with multiple semi-automatic assault rifles that he had legally transformed into automatic weapons. He killed more than fifty people and left more than 500 wounded. Among the victims were mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters.

There was Kelsey Meadows, 28 years old, who after graduating from the University of California, Fresno, returned to her hometown of Taft, California to be a substitute teacher at her alma mater, Taft Union High School. She was described by the high school principal as "smart, compassionate, and kind" with a "sweet spirit and a love for children." Her entire family and community were completely devastated. Kelsey could have been any of us, attending that concert.

My own daughter told me after the Las Vegas shooting that she was supposed to be in the city that evening, but her plans had to change. It was only a little more than a year before the Las Vegas shooting that we experienced what had then been the worst mass shooting in our nation's history. That was when 49 people, who were enjoying an evening of dancing with friends and loved ones, were massacred in Orlando, Florida. Victims in Orlando included 22-year old Luis Velma, who was working at Universal Studios on a Harry Potter ride.

There was also Eddie Justice, a 30-year old accountant who texted his mother from the shooting, telling her: "Mommy I love you." "In club they shooting." "He has us." I encourage every member of this chamber to imagine receiving those text messages from their son or daughter.

And just six months before that, 14 people were killed and more than 20 were injured in San Bernardino, California at a work holiday party. Among the victims was a father of six. A mother of three. A woman who was eight when she and her mother left Vietnam for a better life in America. The youngest victim was 26, and the oldest was 60.

And we should never forget that on December 14, 2012, 20 children had their lives taken at Sandy Hook Elementary School. Children. This issue could not be more important for our children's future.

This past year we saw young men and women begin an incredible movement after the shooting that took place on February 14, 2018, at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. They are setting an

example for all of us. Tens of thousands of students nationwide have taken to the streets to demand action to stop mass shootings and stem the epidemic of gun violence that plagues our communities. Our youngest generation has grown up hiding under their desks, and they have said, "enough."

Following their example, I encourage every member of this body to imagine dropping their young child off at school this morning, only to learn a few hours later that a gunman walked into that school and tried to kill as many people as possible. That is something we can prevent.

The deadly assault weapons used by the attackers in each of the devastating shootings I have mentioned would have been banned under the Assault Weapons Ban bill that I am introducing today. This bill helps keep us safer, while also protecting the rights of lawful gun owners.

It prohibits semi-automatic rifles, handguns, and shotguns that can accept a detachable magazine and have one military characteristic. This is the standard employed in my home state of California—and it works. The bill also prohibits bump-fire stocks, which, as we saw in Las Vegas, allow people to convert semi-automatic rifles to function like machine guns.

Importantly, our legislation further prohibits large-capacity ammunition feeding devices capable of accepting more than ten rounds. It also has several technical updates to the bill that was introduced last Congress. Specifically, it bans stocks that are otherwise foldable or adjustable in a manner that operates to reduce the length, size, or any other dimension, or otherwise enhances the concealability of a weapon. Additionally, it prohibits assault pistols that weigh 50 ounces or more when unloaded, a provision which was originally part of the 1994 ban.

Finally, it bans assault pistol stabilizing braces and Thordsen-type grips and stocks that are designed to evade assault weapons bans. Now, let me tell you what the bill will not do.

It will not affect hunting or sporting firearms. Instead, the bill protects hunters and sportsmen by specifically exempting 2,258 firearms used for hunting or sporting purposes. It also exempts antique, manually-operated, and permanently disabled weapons. Moreover, the bill protects the rights of existing gun owners by grandfathering weapons legally possessed on the date of enactment.

Opponents believe that this legislation impinges upon Second Amendment rights. I disagree. The Supreme Court expressly held in *District of Columbia v. Heller* that "the right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited." The Court made clear that reasonable regulations are constitutional. This bill simply establishes reasonable regulations on what types of weapons may be sold and used. Individuals should not own nuclear weapons, they should not own rocket launchers, and they

should not own military-style assault weapons.

In fact, a number of courts have considered challenges to assault weapons bans. To date, every court that has considered a ban on assault weapons or large-capacity magazines has upheld the law. Mr. President, I believe very strongly that the most important duty that government has to its citizens is to protect the nation and the safety of its people. Now, I am under no illusions. I know that the gun lobby has a stranglehold on this building. I know we got 40 votes in 2013, and I know Republicans control the Senate today.

But I also know this was hard-fought in 1994, and we prevailed—with Republican support. It was a bipartisan vote.

I still believe that, at some point, my Republican colleagues will come together and realize that we can be a nation that protects its people from the savagery of these weapons.

I thank the chair, and I yield the floor.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 67. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the "California Desert Protection and Recreation Act of 2019."

This bill represents a decade-long collaborative effort between conservationists, the off-road vehicle recreational community, State and local governments, small businesses, and public utilities. Through this collaborative effort, we have developed a path forward to sustainably and comprehensively manage California's fragile desert resources.

Before I continue, I would especially like to thank Senators LISA MURKOWSKI and MARIA CANTWELL, as well as their staff, for all of their hard work to move this bill forward last Congress. With their assistance, this legislation passed out of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in October 2018 and was included in a bipartisan public lands package.

Despite the disappointing outcome of last Congress, we have come farther with this bill than ever before, and I look forward to working once again with Senator MURKOWSKI, as well as the newly designated Ranking Member JOE MANCHIN, to maintain our momentum and pass this bill as quickly as possible.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Representative PAUL COOK and his staff for their tremendous work and collaboration on this legislation over the past two years.

The California desert is as special as it is unique. Unlike many deserts in the world, our desert is abundant with plant and animal species, many of

which are only found in California. From the iconic Joshua Trees to the desert tortoise, big horn sheep, and scores of wildflowers, the beauty of the California desert is unrivaled.

I have heard from thousands of constituents who share a love for the peace and tranquility of this majestic area, such as young students from urban areas exposed to the desert for the first time and veterans returning home from warzones finding much-needed quiet in California's desert landscapes.

When I first came to Washington twenty-six years ago, Senator Alan Cranston asked me to assume the mantle and carry on his efforts to protect the desert by introducing and passing a desert protection bill.

Despite opposition, and even filibuster attempts, the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 passed and was signed into law by President Clinton. Since then, we have all watched the unique desert plants, animals, and surrounding communities flourish, attracting visitors from around the world.

The 1994 bill permanently protected more than 7.5 million acres of pristine desert land in national parks and preserves, and I worked closely with President Obama in 2016 to designate three new desert National monuments that protected a further 1.8 million acres.

The original Desert Protection Act was a crowning achievement for desert conservation, establishing 69 new Wilderness areas, creating the Mojave National Preserve, and converting Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Monuments into National Parks. All told, we were able to protect, or increase protections for about 9.6 million acres.

I am proud to have been a part of these achievements for the desert, and I remain steadfast in my commitment to get this legislation across the finish line.

As I mentioned earlier, this bill represents the varied interests of desert stakeholders and balances the many uses of the California desert. I'll highlight some of what's in the bill now.

The bill designates approximately 375,500 acres of wilderness, including eight new Bureau of Land Management (BLM) wilderness areas.

It expands Death Valley National Park Wilderness by approximately 88,000 acres and adds 7,141 acres to the San Geronio Wilderness within San Bernardino National Forest.

This bill also expands Joshua Tree National Park by 4,518 acres and Death Valley National Park by approximately 35,292 acres. The additions to Joshua Tree National Park include 1,600 acres donated by the Mojave Desert Land Trust.

The legislation also officially designates six existing Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Areas totaling 200,580 acres to provide certainty that these recreational uses will be protected and maintained in a manner similar to conservation areas.

Two more additions are the Alabama Hills National Scenic Area in Inyo County and the Vinagre Wash Special Management Area in Imperial County. The Alabama Hills National Scenic Area preserves 18,610 acres for continued recreation and conservation. The Vinagre Wash Special Management Area covers approximately 81,800 acres of Bureau of Land Management land to provide for wilderness preservation, vehicular use on designated routes, and limitations on extractive uses of the land within the management area.

Lastly, this bill designates 77 miles of Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Desert conservation has never been a partisan issue. Over the years, legislators have come together across party lines to preserve and protect California's desert.

Considering our progress and bipartisan efforts last Congress, I am hopeful this Congress will take this legislation up and move it forward as quickly as possible.

This bill represents years of collaborative work and the interests of a wide variety of groups and communities with the shared goal of protecting and sustainably managing California's desert. This area is a true national treasure, and I look forward to continuing our work to protect it for generations to come.

Thank you.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 12—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 12

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Ms. Ernst, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Braun, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune, Mrs. Fischer.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Shelby, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Kennedy, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Daines, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Lankford.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Ms. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cramer, Ms. McSally, Mr. Scott (FL), Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Hawley.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Crapo, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Scott (SC), Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. McSally, Mr. Moran, Mr. Cramer.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Wicker, Mr. Thune,

Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Blackburn, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Lee, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Young, Mr. Scott (FL).

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Daines, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Gardner, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Ms. McSally, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Hoeven.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Inhofe, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Braun, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Shelby, Ms. Ernst.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Scott (SC), Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Young.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Romney, Mr. Graham, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Young, Mr. Cruz.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Scott (SC), Mr. Romney, Mr. Braun.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Romney, Mr. Scott (FL), Mr. Enzi, Mr. Hawley.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Graham, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Tillis, Ms. Ernst, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Kennedy, Mrs. Blackburn.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Sasse.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins, Mr. Scott (SC), Mr. Burr, Ms. McSally, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Braun, Mr. Scott (FL).

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Enzi, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Braun, Mr. Scott (FL), Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Cramer.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Barrasso, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Ms. McSally, Mr. Moran.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Lee, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Portman, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cruz.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Blunt, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Hyde-Smith.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Rubio, Mr. Risch, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott (SC), Ms. Ernst, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Young, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Romney, Mr. Hawley.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Cramer.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Risch.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in the 112th Congress the Senate adopted a new funding allocation for Senate committees. This approach has served the Senate well for the past three Congresses. I believe this approach will continue to serve the interests of the Senate and the public, regardless of which party is in the majority, by helping to retain core committee staff with institutional knowledge. This funding allocation is based on the party division of the Senate, with 10 percent of the total majority and minority salary

baseline going to the majority for administrative expenses. However, regardless of the party division of the Senate, the minority share of the majority and minority salary baseline will never be less than 40 percent, and the majority share will not exceed 60 percent. It is my intent that this approach will continue to serve the Senate for this Congress and future Congresses.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this approach met our needs for the last three Congresses, and I too would like to see it continue. In addition, special reserves have been restored to its historic purpose. We should continue to fund special reserves to the extent possible in order to be able to assist committees that face urgent, unanticipated, nonrecurring needs. Recognizing the tight budgets we will face for the foreseeable future, it is necessary to continue to bring funding authorizations more in line with our actual resources while ensuring that committees are able to fulfill their responsibilities. I look forward to continuing to work with the majority leader to accomplish this.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint leadership letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

WE MUTUALLY COMMIT TO THE FOLLOWING FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS: The Committee on Rules and Administration is to determine the budgets of the committees of the Senate. The budgets of the committees, including joint and special committees, and all other subgroups, shall be apportioned to reflect the ratio of the Senate as of this date, including an additional ten percent (10%) from the majority and minority salary baseline to be allocated to the chairman for administrative expenses.

Special Reserves has been restored to its historic purpose. Requests for funding will only be considered when submitted by a committee chairman and ranking member for unanticipated, non-recurring needs. Such requests shall be granted only upon the approval of the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Funds for committee expenses shall be available to each chairman consistent with the Senate rules and practices of the 115th Congress.

The division of committee office space shall be commensurate with this funding agreement.

The chairman and ranking member of any committee may, by mutual agreement, modify the apportionment of committee funding and office space.

SENATE RESOLUTION 13—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 13

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on

the following committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Brown, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Casey, Ms. Smith, Mr. Durbin.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Reed, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Coons, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Van Hollen.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Reed, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Warren, Mr. Peters, Mr. Manchin, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Jones.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Brown, Mr. Reed, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Tester, Mr. Warner, Ms. Warren, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Jones, Ms. Smith, Ms. Sinema.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Ms. Cantwell, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Markey, Mr. Udall, Mr. Peters, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Tester, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Manchin, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Merkley, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Booker, Mr. Markey, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Van Hollen.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Wyden, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Casey, Mr. Warner, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Udall, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Markey, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Booker.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Casey, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Warren, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Smith, Mr. Jones, Ms. Rosen.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Peters, Mr. Carper, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Harris, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Warner (Vice Chairman), Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. King, Ms. Harris, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Reed (ex officio), Mr. Schumer (ex officio).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Coons, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Booker, Ms. Harris.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sanders, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Harris.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Ms. Klobuchar, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Udall, Mr. Warner, Mr. Leahy, Mr. King, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Cardin, Ms. Cantwell, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Coons, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Rosen.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Tester, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brown, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Manchin, Ms. Sinema.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Casey, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Warren, Mr. Jones, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Rosen.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Peters, Ms. Hassan.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Coons (Vice Chairman), Mr. Schatz, Mrs. Shaheen.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Udall (Vice Chairman), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Tester, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Cortez Masto, Ms. Smith.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff: Heidi Steele, a fellow in my office, during the pendency of the 116th Congress.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dimitrios Meritis, a fellow in my office, be granted privileges of the floor for this session of Congress.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 251, H.R. 264, AND H.R. 269

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are three bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the first time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 251) to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 269) to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, to clarify the regulatory framework with respect to certain nonprescription drugs that are marketed without an approved drug application, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will receive their second readings on the next business day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 10; 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 resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1; finally, notwithstanding the

provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 1 occur at 1:45 p.m.

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 that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MERKLEY.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

DEMOCRACY

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the most important words in our Constitution are the first three: "We the People." With these three simple words, our Founders laid out the mission for our government; that is, a government to produce a form of legislation that reflects the will of the American people or, as Lincoln summarized it, a government of, by, and for the people.

That mission is being corrupted and damaged in a significant and extensive fashion. It is being damaged with a goal of converting this vision of "We the People" to a government by and for the powerful and the privileged. That corruption, that fundamental corruption of our government, comes in many forms, but it certainly includes gerrymandering, voter suppression, voter intimidation, and dark money in our campaigns flooding our system with unidentified resources to serve the powerful and the privileged rather than the people.

We in this Chamber, having taken an oath of allegiance to our Constitution, ought to be defending it, but we are not. The result is, we see many challenges facing our Nation unaddressed: stagnant wages and soaring income inequality, huge wealth inequality; skyrocketing healthcare costs; unaffordable higher education and homeownership; rent so high they drive people to live in tents; catastrophic climate chaos wreaking havoc on our planet with uncontrolled carbon pollution.

We have been paralyzed on these issues because of this corruption of our Constitution, because of the gerrymandering, because of the voter suppression intimidation, because of the dark money. It has allowed the hijacking of our Constitution, and we need to end it. It has been hijacked by corporate and Wall Street executives swimming in recordbreaking profits and trillion-dollar tax breaks, shuttering American factories and shipping jobs overseas. It has been hijacked by fossil fuel barons who exhibit a greed for profits that trumps the direct damage—or concern about the direct damage they are inflicting on our beautiful blue-green planet. It has been hijacked

by cabals of shadowy organizations, using vast sums of dark money, no identified source, to influence and buy elections, undermining our institutions at every level and driving massive cynicism among our youth.

Our youth look at our government, and they see those beautiful words: "We the People," and then they see the corruption, the corruption this body is doing nothing to address—not the gerrymandering, not the voter suppression, not the dark money. It is time to change that.

I have laid out a blueprint for our "we the people" democracy. I unveiled this document last week. I am happy to provide copies to anyone. It is available on the web. It is a blueprint for restoring our democracy that takes on the corrupting influence of dark money, takes on the corrupting influence of gerrymandering, takes on the corruption of voter suppression to ensure equal representation for every American.

Let's start by looking at dark money. We need to pass Senator UDALL's constitutional amendment that overturns Citizens United and thereby end the corruption of the unlimited dark money.

According to one analysis, the top 15 dark money groups in America has spent over \$600 million on campaign-related activities in the last few years. That is just the top 15 groups, writing check after check to drown out the voice of the people. It is kind of like the dark money is a stadium sound system cranked up to the top volume so voices and concerns of millions of ordinary Americans are wiped out, unheard, unlistened to; thus, driving decisions of this body in favor of the powerful instead of the people.

It is why we need to give Congress the ability to set reasonable limits on campaign spending and donations through that constitutional amendment. That is why we need to increase transparency on all money in the campaign system through Senator WHITEHOUSE's DISCLOSE Act. His act calls for robust disclosure for corporate union, PACs, 501(c)(3)s that contribute over \$10,000. It is why we need transparency through Senator KLOBUCHAR's Honest Ads Act, which addresses the transparency of online ads, which are becoming a bigger and bigger part of our dialogue over campaigns in this country, the social media side. It requires those who purchase and publish those online ads to publicly disclose their financing.

Thomas Jefferson laid out how important an equal distribution of power is among the voters. He called it his equal voice principle, and he said this: "[A] government is republican in proportion as every member composing it has his equal voice in the direction of its concerns"—equal voice. He said in this letter, after he was President, that if we lose this, which he called the mother principle of our democracy, we would not have laws that reflect the will of the people.

So here we are with the mother principle—a distribution of power among voters, a distribution of voice among voters. That, as the securing factor for government, reflects the will of the people.

This is in complete opposition to the concentration of power through Citizens United.

Let us turn to the corruption from gerrymandering. Now, there is a bit of a challenge to define what gerrymandering is, but let's try putting it this way: the drawing of funny-shaped districts in order to unbalance fair representation of voters in a State.

Now, here are some of the warning signs if you want to say it is gerrymandered. First, look to the districts and see if they are of funny shapes like these—like Nebraska, like the Fifth Congressional District in Florida, like the Seventh Congressional District in Pennsylvania, like the Maryland Third Congressional District, like the North Carolina First District, and the Texas Thirty-third District—blue States, red States, all exhibiting varieties of gerrymandering.

Another way to look at gerrymandering is to look at an imbalance in wasted votes. That is, you take the number of votes required to elect someone in a particular congressional district and add up the surplus of those votes, and you add those up on the Democratic side and you add those up on the Republican side, and if there is a huge imbalance in the wasted votes, then probably these districts have been drawn to unbalance fair representation for people in the State.

A third way to look at gerrymandering is to look at whether the congressional representation in the House of Representatives is proportional to the popular vote totals in a State.

So those three things are warning signs.

How should this be addressed? It should be addressed through having national standards for independent redistricting commissions so that the citizens of the United States across the entire United States get fair representation in Congress and for the ridding of gerrymandering in the United States of America.

In 2016, North Carolina Republicans had 53 percent of the State's popular vote in House races but 77 percent of the congressional seats. That is a sign of gerrymandering. The same year, Pennsylvania Democrats won 48 percent of the popular vote in their State but only had 27 percent of the House seats.

So these are signs of a rigged system, and if you want to drive cynicism, keep a rigged system.

The House of Representatives is supposed to stand for equal representation for people, not for a biased, corrupted, rigged system that we get from gerrymandering.

So we need to take the power for redistricting out of the hands of partisan

elected officials and put it in the hands of independent commissions to draw fair, competitive congressional districts to truly reflect the voters' voices.

Now, as for that Pennsylvania gerrymandered seat that I referred to, after the 2016 election, the State supreme court stepped in and redrew the district lines to make them more fair and representative.

So what happened? Let's compare 2016 to 2018.

In 2016, you had the Democrats receiving 48 percent of the popular vote and 27 percent of the congressional districts, a gap of more than 20 percent. After the redrawing, you had Democrats receiving 53 percent of the popular vote across the State and winning 50 percent of the contested seats. So a gap of 21 percent goes down to a gap of just 3 percent. That is a sign that the State has been more fairly drawn to reflect the distribution of voters. It shows that the voters are being heard and that the corruption of gerrymandering is being ended. But it shouldn't just be ended in Pennsylvania. It should be ended across the country.

Now, the U.S. Supreme Court has punted on gerrymandering. In fact, it has been at the heart of each of these three corrupting practices: unleashing dark money through Citizens United; striking down the Voting Rights Act of 1965, allowing an unlimited set of strategies—a huge set of strategies—for voter suppression and voter intimidation; and never taking on the issue of gerrymandering.

Maybe the U.S. Supreme Court should read the Constitution and realize what Jefferson was talking about and realize that it is their job to defend the integrity of the United States of America and take on these corrupting forces that they themselves have unleashed in two instances and failed to take on in the third.

Well, voter suppression and voter intimidation are certainly alive and well as corrupting forces. That is why the Blueprint for Democracy calls for the passage of Senator LEAHY's Voting Rights Advancement Act. The bill would restore and modernize the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which the Supreme Court tore down in 2013 with their decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

Now, realize that the Voting Rights Act reauthorization had vast bipartisan support here in the Senate. This wasn't a partisan bill. The voting right is the fundamental foundation of our democratic republic, and it had broad bipartisan support, as it should. But the Supreme Court, in the interest of the powerful and privileged, tore down—they are no longer the defenders of the vision of our Constitution but the destroyers of the "we the people" vision of our Constitution. That should concern every Member in this body.

We have seen rampant voter suppression in our national elections used to

block entire groups of people from exercising their constitutional rights at the ballot box.

Just this last November, we saw thousands of Native Americans living on Tribal reserves in North Dakota kept from casting a ballot. In Georgia, we saw the former secretary of state, who was running for Governor, attempt to block 53,000 Georgians, predominantly African Americans, from voting because of what were described as minor clerical inconsistencies. We saw thousands of Ohio voters purged from voting rolls on the order of the secretary of state of Ohio, and done so in a way disproportionately benefiting one party over the other.

That is just scratching the surface of the list of deplorable schemes to disenfranchise American voters.

There was one positive development that was in Florida, where Florida restored the ability of felons to vote after they have served their sentences.

Now, this process of taking away the ability of felons to vote has a deep, deep history of racism in our country. It was used after the Civil War to disenfranchise Black Americans so that White Americans could control areas that were predominantly African American.

So this use of the felon disenfranchisement—failure to restore the right to vote after you have served your sentence—is something that has to be put away, and Florida set a great example in doing so.

There is much more that we can do. We can have a polling place protection act, because the manipulation of polling places is just an irresistible strategy for election clerks. They move the polling places. They cut the hours of polling. Disinformation is put out about where they are. You have a process where some polling places that serve predominantly one community that may vote primarily on one party suddenly don't have enough clerks or enough voting machines so they have long lines here and short lines there to warp the outcome of an election.

So how about a polling place protection act? Isn't that something Democrats and Republicans can come together and do?

How about predatory purging of voter lists, where you analyze the voting list and decide for rules on purging voters in order to disproportionately favor one party over the other? Why not have standard policies across the country so that purging in a predatory partisan fashion is done away with? Shouldn't that be something on which Democrats and Republicans can come together and defend the integrity of American elections?

How about requiring paper ballots so that every election can be recounted? I always heard about these electronic voting machines with no paper ballots. Now, out in Oregon, we insist on paper ballots. We want people to have confidence that the election has not been messed with, that the voting machines have not been hacked.

I remember listening to a radio news story where a person went in and hacked the voting machine while they were on the radio with the reporter and changed the vote totals.

So shouldn't we require paper ballots that can be recounted to give confidence in America that the vote is not being hacked? Isn't that something that Democrats and Republicans can come together to support? Isn't it something that helps to make sure that foreign agents—Russian agents, Chinese agents, who knows whom—are not trying to hack our elections?

While we are at it, how about a national standard for early voting to ensure that people have the flexibility to come to the polls, to make sure the hours are not manipulated in a fashion to try to favor one party over the other.

Better yet, how about Senator WYDEN's Vote By Mail Act? In Oregon, we have a special affection for this. Back when I was first running for the Oregon House of Representatives 20 years ago, in my first election, half the people of Oregon voted by mail and half at the polls, and I started going door to door to campaign, and I didn't really like this whole vote-by-mail idea because I felt it was important for the community to do something together on election day.

As I knocked on one door after another, one senior after another said: No, I really love this ability to vote by mail, because if it is rainy or icy in November, if there is snow that makes it hard to get to the polling place, it is no problem.

They said: And moreover, I really love to be at the kitchen table with my children or with my grandchildren and have the ability, then, to talk with them about these issues as we vote and inculcate them with the civic responsibility of voting.

Another said: You know, here in Oregon we have initiatives that can be very complicated. I love to sit at my kitchen table and study these initiatives and vote.

So I realized how popular it was. So there it was—vote by mail, a very important contribution to the possibility of high integrity in elections of the United States of America.

This last November, we had nationwide about 47 percent of the eligible adults voting—about 47 percent. That was better than 2014, when we had 37 percent. So that is pretty good—47 percent.

In Oregon, with vote by mail, we had 68 percent of the eligible adults voting—20 percent over the national standard. So that gives you a little sense of how automatic voter registration and vote by mail can make a difference in enabling people to fully participate.

If you believe in the vision of a democratic republic, don't you want to be on the side of voter engagement—not voter intimidation, not voter suppression?

A fourth area is equal representation. So we have had a number of elections where we created a discrepancy between the popular vote and the outcome for President—another factor driving citizens. The whole electoral college was set up in a world in which communication was very difficult. It might take weeks to get the votes to the Capitol, but that is not the world we live in any longer.

So isn't it time to go to a direct vote?

Back in the 2000 election, 48 percent of the voters picked Al Gore for President, and that was a majority, but we had 8 years of George Bush.

The electoral college is antiquated—an antiquated idea based on a historical factor of communication that no longer exists.

So let's move to direct vote, either through the national popular vote, which can be done State by State by State by sending their electoral votes to the candidate who wins the majority, or through a constitutional amendment.

And while we are at it, let's give voting representation in the House and Senate to the 4 million people who currently are American citizens who do not have a vote in the Presidential election.

While we are at it, let's give voting representation in the House and Senate to the 4 million people who currently are American citizens who do not have a vote in the House or Senate. For the people of Puerto Rico, Guam, a number of other Territories, and the Virgin Islands, shouldn't there at least be one person in this Chamber representing them?

I went down to Puerto Rico 8 months after the big hurricane to look at the restoration, and the restoration program was horrific. I came away thinking, if there was somebody who stood in this Chamber with a vote or in the House Chamber with a vote and could speak to the abysmal restoration of infrastructure after that hurricane, it

would not have been such a disaster. We would all have listened and responded and helped. But there was nobody here that represented them. A number of us tried to carry their message, their plea, but it is different than having somebody who carries a vote.

So let's figure out a system—some system. No system will satisfy everyone, but give at least a vote in the Senate and a vote in the House for the portion of the population of those American citizens who do not have a vote.

So our constitutional system is in very deep trouble. When I came into political life we had a Voting Rights Act that had taken on the issue of voter intimidation and voter suppression. We don't have it today, thanks to the Supreme Court. Corruption is inhabiting our “we the people” Constitution.

When I came in we had a system that was much more transparent with people making donations to candidates, and today we have vast dark money corrupting the system.

Gerrymandering has been with us for a long time. Isn't it time that we address that? Shouldn't it be a situation in which voters pick their representatives, not representatives picking their voters? Isn't it time to address a national popular vote?

We have allowed so much to happen. We haven't pushed back the failure of the Supreme Court to defend our Constitution. When they struck down the Voting Rights Act, they said Congress can repass another one. But have we done so? Have we had a vote on the floor of the Senate since the Voting Rights Act was struck down? Do we have bipartisan buy-in that it is our responsibility to protect voters to have a fair process? If not, why not? It is way past time. So let each of us ponder the vision of our Constitution—the “we the people” vision of our Constitution. Let's remember that we took an oath to honor this vision and that we are failing. Now, in recognition of that, let's come together—Democrats and

Republicans, House Members and Senate Members—and take on this vast corruption that is destroying the fundamental vision on which our Nation was founded—a vision I love, a vision that will produce laws by and for the people, a vision that produces laws the reflect, as Thomas Jefferson said, the will of the people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:44 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 10, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

HEATH P. TARBERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION, VICE J. CHRISTOPHER GIANCARLO.

HEATH P. TARBERT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2024, VICE J. CHRISTOPHER GIANCARLO, TERM EXPIRING.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

MICHAEL GRAHAM, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2020, VICE EARL F. WEENER, TERM EXPIRED.

JENNIFER L. HOMENDY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2024. (REAPPOINTMENT)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ANDREW WHEELER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE SCOTT FRUITT.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

GEOFFREY WILLIAM SELJI OKAMOTO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE RAMIN TOLOUI.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. MICHAEL X. GARRETT

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, due to a meeting at the White House, I was unable to vote during the following roll calls on December 21, 2018. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 483; YEA on Roll Call No. 484; YEA on Roll Call No. 485; YEA on Roll Call No. 486; YEA on Roll Call No. 487; YEA on Roll Call No. 488; YEA on Roll Call No. 489; YEA on Roll Call No. 490; YEA on Roll Call No. 491; YEA on Roll Call No. 492; YEA on Roll Call No. 493; YEA on Roll Call No. 494; YEA on Roll Call No. 495; YEA on Roll Call No. 496; YEA on Roll Call No. 497; and YEA on Roll Call No. 498.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I reintroduced the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Act. I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives JERRY MCNERNEY, MARK DESAULNIER, MIKE THOMPSON, and DORIS MATSUI from California, for their support as original cosponsors.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is central to California life and perhaps the most productive and ecologically important watershed in the United States. Designating the Delta as a new Natural Heritage Area would unlock needed federal funding to conserve the cultural heritage and natural character of this iconic working landscape.

Specifically, our bill would authorize \$10 million to provide federal matching grants to local governments, historical societies, and non-profit organizations throughout the Delta. This grant funding, administered by the National Park Service, would be available for 15 years to support community-based cultural and historical preservation and environmental conservation projects.

California's Delta Protection Commission would be responsible for coordinating the locally developed management plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area, once established. Importantly, National Heritage Area designations do not impact water rights, landownership, or hunting and fishing within the designated Heritage Area. As confirmed by the National Park Service, which administers the program, National Heritage Area designations do not affect individual property rights nor do they restrict local land use decisions.

Last year, for the first time in 5 years, the Natural Resources Committee reported out bi-

partisan bills to establish new National Heritage Areas. Now under the new Democratic majority and the leadership of Chairman RAÚL M. GRIJALVA (D-AZ), I hope that the Committee will take up our Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Act.

Again, I thank my original cosponsors from the California delegation for their support. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join us in cosponsoring the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Act.

CONGRATULATING COACH CHRIS METZGER OF PINECREST HIGH SCHOOL U.S. CELLULAR 2018 MOST VALUABLE COACH

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chris Metzger, the 2018 U.S. Cellular Most Valuable Coach from Pinecrest High School in North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District.

Chris has served as the head football coach for the last 11 years and has had a tremendous impact on the football program and community. Pinecrest High School and the football program are pillars in the community that borders Fort Bragg. When he started, the program was struggling to compete and most students were not academically eligible to play. Today, the team has 84 wins and his players are successful on and off the field.

Coach Metzger is a man of high character and sees the positive in people. He has instilled a sense of pride in his players and pushed them to be men of perseverance, hard work, and determination. He has encouraged them to recognize their blessings and give back to the community.

U.S. Cellular awarded Coach Metzger and Pinecrest High School with a \$50,000 school grant and a Samsung technology package for the school. Coach Metzger was nominated by people in the community and chosen by a panel of judges including Green Bay Packers wide receiver Randall Cobb and WNBA All-Star Maya Moore.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Coach Chris Metzger on receiving the 2018 U.S. Cellular Most Valuable Coach Award.

RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE BEAR LAKE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL IN MONTPELIER, IDAHO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an outstanding rural hos-

pital in Southeast Idaho. The hospital I am referring to is the Bear Lake Memorial Hospital. This hospital was honored with two prestigious awards in 2018 by the National Rural Health Association. They were awarded Top 20 honors as a Critical Access Hospital and for Best Practices in Quality among rural hospitals.

Bear Lake Memorial Hospital is located in Montpelier, Idaho, in the Southeast corner of Idaho. Montpelier is the biggest town in Bear Lake County. It is a small town with a population of less than 3,000, yet manages to provide some of the best rural healthcare in our nation.

The National Rural Health Association compared Bear Lake Memorial Hospital with over 1300 other critical access hospitals. Bear Lake Memorial Hospital scored in the 99.6th percentile overall, making them one of the Top 20 Critical Access Hospitals in the country.

Bear Lake Memorial Hospital was also awarded Top 20 Best Practices in Quality among the 1300 rural hospitals surveyed. This award is based on a hospital's exceptional performance across five categories of Hospital Compare Process of Care measures. Bear Lake Memorial Hospital is being recognized by National Rural Health Association for the outstanding quality of service and care they deliver to their patients and community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I was absent January 8, 2019. If I were present, I would have voted on the following:

Roll No. 13—H.R. 269—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill: Yea;

Roll No. 14—H.R. 251—On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill: Yea; and

Roll No. 15—JOURNAL—On approving the journal: Yea.

RECOGNIZING SUPERVISOR MARION ASHLEY FOR HIS YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Supervisor Marion Ashley on his retirement after more than twenty-five years of serving in elected office.

Since 2002, Supervisor Ashley has been a tireless advocate for Riverside County's Fifth District, bringing his energy, leadership, and enthusiasm to the cause of serving his constituents. As we have worked together over the years, I've known Supervisor Ashley to be a man of integrity and compassion, always

• 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.

ready to put the interests of others before his own.

Supervisor Ashley grew up in Riverside County, and like me, has had the privilege of returning home to serve the community that helped raise him. To see his positive impact on towns like Banning, Beaumont, and Calimesa, you only need to look around. You'll see medical centers, public parks, wildlife conservation areas, and fire stations that exist thanks to his advocacy.

During his decades of public service, Supervisor Ashley has demonstrated his strong commitment to positioning Riverside County as a leader in environmental conservation and renewable energy. He has helped Riverside County protect our Desert habitats and wildlife and become a national leader in wind and solar energy. He has personally donated hundreds of acres of land in pursuit of those goals.

Throughout his tenure, Supervisor Ashley has shown a willingness to work on a bipartisan basis. He has welcomed innovative ideas and treated opponents and allies with respect.

In retirement, I hope Supervisor Ashley will enjoy spending more time with Mary, his wife of more than sixty years, and their six children, 19 grandchildren, and 9 great-grandchildren. On behalf of communities across Riverside County, it is my honor to congratulate Supervisor Ashley on a well-earned retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. LaMALFA. Madam Speaker, due to flight issues, I was not able to get back to Washington DC in time for votes on January 8, 2019.

Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on Roll Call No. 013 (H.R. 269), Yea on Roll Call No. 014 (H.R. 251), and Nay on Roll Call No. 15.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF VICENTE "BEN" GUMATAOTAO

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Vicente "Ben" Diaz Gumataotao. "Mayor Ben," as he was widely known as, was steadfast in his dedication to serving the people of Guam and his country. In his 91 years of life, Mayor Ben achieved significant milestones that not only inspired generations but opened doors for those who came after him.

Mayor Ben was born on November 30, 1927 to the late Josefina Diaz and the late Leon Diaz Gumataotao. The third child of twelve children, Mayor Ben and his family resided in the pre-World War II village of Sumay. Mayor Ben and his family lived through the traumatic events during the Japanese Occupation of Guam during World War II. In one instance, his family was forced to march to the

Manenggon Hills concentration camp where he witnessed the atrocities executed by the Japanese soldiers.

Grateful for the United States military's return to the island and overthrow of the Japanese Imperial government's control over Guam, Mayor Ben served over twenty-eight years in the United States Navy where he completed Mess Management School and instructed fellow stewards. He retired at the highest enlisted rank in the United States Navy, the rank of Master Chief Petty Officer (E-9).

After his service to his country, Mayor Ben began his service to the people of Guam working for various senators in the Guam Legislature and later for former Congressman Vicente C. Blaz during the 101st and 102nd United States Congress.

He answered the call of his fellow residents and successfully was elected Mayor of the village of Piti. Significant improvements throughout the village continue to be seen and felt due to Mayor Ben's unwavering leadership during his tenure as Mayor. In his lifetime, his advocacy and dedication to public service was appreciated through the various civic and religious organizations he was actively engaged in throughout the island of Guam.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Mayor Vicente "Ben" Diaz Gumataotao, and I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and the legacy he left. A dedicated public servant, he worked to improve the quality of life in his village of Piti and in the wider community in Guam during his lifetime. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, loved ones, and friends. Mayor Ben will be deeply missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

HONORING JESSE HERNANDEZ

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Jesse Hernandez, a close member of our Phoenix community, devoted to his family and spiritual fellowship, and a long-time political activist in Arizona. Jesse not only served as a member of my district staff, serving as Director of Outreach, but he also devoted himself to the Arizona Latino Republican Association, where he served as Chairman and Executive Director. His hard work and commitment to his community truly helped make a difference in the lives of his fellow Arizonans. He served his country proudly in the United States Marine Corps, and we are forever grateful for his sacrifice and service to our nation.

Jesse had great love for his family and always supported everyone in their personal journeys to grow and learn. He was a role model and inspiration to his family: Margaret, James, Jessica, and Elvia, as well as his grandchildren. To all who knew Jesse, we shall continue to cherish the memories of his wit, laughter, love of family, friends and faith, and his commitment to the Republican Party.

Jesse served unselfishly for the betterment of others. May we continue to honor his memory through our passion and service to our communities.

HONORING L&F DISTRIBUTORS

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize L&F Distributors and all of its diligent employees. This year, L&F Distributors celebrates 40 years of successfully serving South Texans premium beverages, and I could not be happier to have such talented entrepreneurs in my district.

Purchased in 1978 by Joe LaMantia Jr., this family business started with only a handful of employees and one location in McAllen, Texas. Over four decades later, this third-generation family owned company has taken Texas by storm with locations across 35 counties in Texas and now Southern New Mexico. It is truly an honor to represent such a prestigious example of how impactful local businesses are in our economies. I look forward to watching them continue to grow in Texas and beyond.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to represent the hard-working individuals of L&F Distributors. Their success is a shining example of what the 15th District of Texas has to offer.

THE PASSING OF LORETTA JONES

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 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 a 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, on roll call votes 13, 14 and 15, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on all three.

MEGAN O'GRADY—HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT FROM CAPE CORAL HONORS FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank Megan O'Grady, a high school student from Cape Coral and founder of Blue Line Bears, for the work she has done to honor fallen police officers.

Through her non-profit organization, Blue Line Bears, Megan makes teddy bears using the uniforms of fallen police officers and delivers them to the officers' families. The daughter of a police officer, Megan was inspired to do something for the families of law enforcement in the wake of the murder of 5 police officers in Dallas.

Megan is especially grateful for the opportunity to make the bears for children and to provide them with tangible mementos of their loved ones. Since she started two years ago, Megan has made 454 bears for families in 36 states.

I am grateful for Megan and her commitment to honor police officers and I look forward to seeing what the future holds for Blue Line Bears.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, on Monday, January 8, 2019, I was unavoidably detained attending to representational duties in my congressional district and was not present for Roll Call Votes 13, 14, and 15. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

On Roll Call 13, I would have voted AYE on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 269, Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness and Advancing Innovation Act of 2019.

On Roll Call 14, I would have voted AYE on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 4406, H.R. 251, Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act.

On Roll Call 15, I would have voted AYE on Motion to Approve the Journal.

CONGRATULATING CRAIG W. FLOYD ON HIS RETIREMENT AS CEO OF THE NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS MEMORIAL FUND

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Craig W. Floyd, who retired on December 31, 2018 as the CEO of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund after over 30 years of distinguished service.

Mr. Floyd has been a strong law enforcement advocate for over 40 years, beginning with the 10 years he served as Legislative Assistant for my late friend and decorated NYPD legend, Congressman Mario Biaggi. Mr. Floyd helped form the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund with Biaggi, serving as its CEO from the outset.

Under Mr. Floyd's leadership the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund has gone above and beyond in its mission of telling the story of American law enforcement. Mr. Floyd oversaw the construction of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, which was dedicated in 1991. This monument contains the names of over 21,000 fallen law enforcement officers dating back to the first documented line of duty death in 1791. Today, the Memorial Fund maintains the world's most comprehensive database of police officers killed in the line of duty.

During his tenure Mr. Floyd has also overseen the enactment of a federal law authorizing all American flags to be flown at half-staff on "Peace Officers Memorial Day"; enactment of a federal law authorizing 500,000 commemorative silver dollars to be issued by the U.S. Mint honoring the service and sacrifice of America's law enforcement officers and their families; publication of the book, *To Serve and Protect: A Tribute to American Law Enforcement*; 30 annual candlelight vigils honoring fallen police officers during the Memorial Fund's signature event, National Police Week, which attract a crowd of 30,000; and the open-

ing of the National Law Enforcement Museum on October 13, 2018.

As the son of an NYPD officer, I commend Mr. Floyd on his outstanding contributions to members of the law enforcement community and thank him on behalf of myself and all those who are undoubtedly better off because of his efforts. I wish Mr. Floyd all the best in his retirement.

HONORING LT. COL. HAROLD "HAL" FRITZ ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Harold "Hal" Fritz on the 50th Anniversary of receiving his Medal of Honor. Lt. Col. Fritz is one of 74 living Medal of Honor recipients.

A resident of Peoria, Illinois for the past 25 years, Lt. Col. Fritz honorably served our nation as a platoon leader in the Vietnam War. During his time as a Captain, Lt. Col. Fritz acted with great courage to receive the Medal of Honor. Captain Fritz was leading his fellow soldiers on a convoy when they were suddenly ambushed, and as a result, surrounded by the enemy. After receiving heavy fire, Captain Fritz was wounded, but instead of treating himself, he thought of those fighting alongside him. Captain Fritz responded swiftly by returning fire, directing the men with him, and treating their wounds. These extraordinary actions taken by Captain Fritz led him and his men away from danger. Lt. Col. Fritz showed immense bravery, and I commend him on his actions during the Vietnam War. The Medal of Honor is a great distinction and it is fitting that Lt. Col. Fritz actions are recognized in this way.

It is because of dedicated and selfless leaders such as Lt. Col. Harold "Hal" Fritz that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally honor Lt. Col. Hal Fritz on the 50th Anniversary of his receipt of the Medal of Honor.

HONORING FELIPE HUERTA

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I stand today to honor the life of Felipe Huerta, Jr. I was deeply saddened to hear that Felipe passed away on Sunday, December 16 2018.

Felipe served his community as an EMS medic for three and a half years. He also served his country as a Marine, having been deployed twice to Afghanistan. He was awarded the Purple Heart for the sacrifices he made protecting our great nation.

Everything we hold dear as a community, state, and country is owed to the brave sacrifice of service members like Mr. Huerta. Felipe was a true patriot and hero who will always be remembered for his dedication to

serving others. I know that Felipe's legacy will inspire future generations to honorably serve our fellow man.

Madam Speaker, last month our country lost a veteran, and one of its kindest individuals. His family will be in my thoughts and prayers. It is a privilege to represent individuals like Felipe Huerta, Jr. and his family.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
GENNARO (JERRY) CIANCIOTTA

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 2019

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the service and sacrifice of Gennaro (Jerry) Cianciotta who was born on January 13, 1919, grew up in the Bensonhurst section of Brooklyn and now resides in Ronkonkoma, New York.

Jerry enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps during the summer of 1940 and was sent to Fort Benning in Georgia where he was assigned to the Fifteenth Air Corps Group—68th Materiel. Upon completion of Basic Training, Jerry was transferred to Africa where he encountered enemy fire and bombings by the German military. Tasked with the treacherous job of refueling aircrafts, he achieved the rank of Corporal and was awarded multiple awards for his service, including a Good Conduct medal.

Jerry was then sent to England, where the enemy aggression continued. "I was really lucky," Jerry stated in reference to surviving the bombs and fire he encountered. After serving in England for a year, Jerry, who was fluent in Italian, was sent to Italy, where he remained until just prior to the end of World War II. Having returned home on leave to get married at the conclusion of the war, Jerry returned to Fort Dix, New Jersey, where he was honorably discharged.

For his service and sacrifice, our Nation will always be indebted to Buck Sergeant Gennaro (Jerry) Cianciotta, and his bravery and selflessness, then and now, continues to inspire us all.

ADOPTING THE RULES OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, after a century of trying, under the leadership of Speaker NANCY PELOSI and our nation's 44th President, Barack Obama, the Affordable Care Act became the law of the land.

Before the Affordable Care Act, untold millions of Americans lived with the reality that they did not have access to Affordable Care Act.

Before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, 17.1 percent of Americans lacked health insurance; today nearly nine of ten (89.1 percent) are insured, which is the highest rate since Gallup began tracking insurance coverage in 2008.

Because of the Affordable Healthcare Act: insurance companies are banned from discriminating against anyone, including 17 million children, with a preexisting condition, or charging higher rates based on gender or health status; 6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans; 100 million Americans no longer have annual or life-time limits on healthcare coverage; 6.3 million seniors in the "donut hole" have saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs; 3.2 million seniors now get free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and 360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers; Pregnancy is no longer a pre-existing condition and women can no longer be charged a higher rate just because they are women.

This bill was fiercely debated for over a year. It passed both houses of Congress and was signed by President Obama on March 23, 2010.

The bill did many things—it improved access to quality care; made care more affordable, and improved the quality of the law.

It also advanced several pillars that will undoubtedly advance healthcare in America.

For example, the Affordable Care Act:

Lowers the uninsured rate. Gallup recently estimated that the uninsured rate in Texas in 2015 was 22.3 percent, down from 27.0 percent in 2013. In 2017, the number was at 16 percent.

Prohibits coverage denials and reduced benefits, protecting as many as 10,694,840 Texans who have some type of pre-existing health condition, including 1,632,475 children.

Eliminates lifetime and annual limits on insurance coverage and establishes annual limits on out-of-pocket spending on essential health benefits, benefiting 7,536,000 people in Texas, including 2,771,000 women and 2,094,000 children.

Allows states to expand Medicaid to all non-eligible adults with incomes under 133 percent of the federal poverty level. If Texas expands Medicaid, an additional 1,107,000 uninsured people would gain coverage.

Establishes a system of state and federal Health Insurance Exchanges, or Marketplaces, to make it easier for individuals and small-business employees to purchase health plans at affordable prices. During the open enrollment period for 2016 coverage, 1,306,208 people in Texas selected a plan through the Marketplace, including approximately 626,980 new consumers and 378,800 young adults. In Texas, 78 percent of Marketplace consumers could have selected a plan for \$100 per month or less after tax credits for 2016 coverage.

Created a temporary high-risk pool program to cover uninsured people with pre-existing conditions prior to 2014 reforms, which helped 10,336 people in Texas.

And, the ACA creates health plan disclosure requirements and simple, standardized summaries so 12,620,500 people in Texas can better understand coverage information and compare benefits.

With respect to the affordability of care, the ACA made marked improvements in this sphere, too. For example, the ACA:

Creates a tax credit that, during the most recent open enrollment period, has helped 1,093,573 Marketplace enrollees in Texas who otherwise might not be able to afford it sign up for health coverage through the Health Insurance Marketplace.

Requires health insurers to provide consumers with rebates if the amount they spend on health benefits and quality of care, as opposed to advertising and marketing, is too low. Last year, 96,024 consumers in Texas received \$14,119,897 in rebates. Since this requirement was put in place in 2011 more than \$2.4 billion in total refunds have been paid to consumers nationwide through 2014.

Eliminates out-of-pocket costs for preventive services like immunizations, certain cancer screenings, contraception, reproductive counseling, obesity screening, and behavioral assessments for children. This coverage is guaranteed for 10,278,005 people in Texas, including 4,029,215 women.

Eliminates out-of-pocket costs for 2,556,874 Medicare beneficiaries in Texas for preventive services like cancer screenings, bone-mass measurements, annual physicals, and smoking cessation.

Phases out the "donut hole" coverage gap for 346,750 Medicare prescription drug beneficiaries in Texas, who have saved an average of \$1,057 per beneficiary.

Creates Accountable Care Organizations consisting of doctors and other health-care providers who come together to provide coordinated, high-quality care at lower costs to 564,161 Medicare beneficiaries in Texas.

Phases out overpayments through the Medicare Advantage system, while requiring Medicare Advantage plans to spend at least 85 percent of Medicare revenue on patient care. Since 2009, Medicare Advantage enrollment has grown by 704,407 to 1,230,523 in Texas while premiums have dropped by 10 percent nationwide.

And, the ACA also improved quality of care, too. For example, the ACA:

Provides incentives to hospitals in Medicare to reduce hospital-acquired infections and avoidable readmissions. Creates a collaborative health-safety learning network, the Partnership for Patients, which includes 121 hospitals in Texas, to promote best quality practices. Avoidable readmissions have fallen since 2010, saving 87,000 lives and \$20 billion in health care costs, and the rate of one common deadly hospital acquired infection, central-line blood stream infections, fell by 50 percent from 2008 to 2014 nationwide.

Yet, for some reason, Republicans filed countless legal challenges to this law.

On two separate occasions, the United States Supreme Court has ruled on the validity of the Affordable Care Act.

In 2012, it pushed back on a challenge arguing that the ACA is unconstitutional.

In 2015, the Supreme Court pushed back on a statutory challenge to the ACA.

In both instances, the United States Supreme Court upheld the Affordable Care Act and did so with a Supreme Court Justice appointed by a Republican President.

Following these two endorsements of the law by the Supreme Court, the law appeared safe.

Until last month, when a sole federal district judge in Texas invalidated the Affordable Care Act based on perverse logic.

The genesis of this entire litigation is has been problematic.

Texas v. United States as an action filed in Texas by our state attorney general, who is currently under criminal indictment.

The matter was then joined by state attorneys general, who now pledge to fight the House's vigorous appeal of this matter.

That judge's ruling indicated that when Republicans in Congress, as part of the GOP tax scam, repealed the individual mandate of the Affordable Care Act—that part of the law that required all to have proof of health insurance or pay a penalty—they in effect invalidated the whole law, rendering it unconstitutional.

This is absurd. First, it ignores the fact that the Affordable Care Act has twice been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Second, despite the fact that the Supreme Court has twice ruled on the ACA, it has never endorsed the perverse reasoning underlying this district court's ruling.

To be clear, in *NFIB v. Sebellius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012), the Supreme Court held that the penalty for failing to buy health insurance was a constitutional exercise of the Congress's tax and spending power, not that it must be, or that the provision of the law at issue from the tax is otherwise unconstitutional in the absence of it.

It follows that a district court invalidating a law as unconstitutional based on this provision, without giving to the Congress the opportunity to fix the infirmity, smacks of the type of judicial activism which the American political right often laments, especially when the Supreme Court has twice ruled on the law's constitutionality.

The ruling was met by cheers and applause by the President and Congressional Republicans, whose singular policy mission over the last eight years has been to end the Affordable Care Act, and in the process take away the health care that millions of individuals receive through it.

Let me first state that the Affordable Care Act, which House Republicans derisively call Obamacare, is still the law of the land.

The ruling issued by a federal district court judge in the Northern District of Texas is wrong on the facts, the law, and will not stand.

Unfortunately, the present administration occupying the White House is a sworn opponent of the Affordable Care Act, and the provisions it contains, like protecting people with pre-existing conditions and ensuring that young adults can stay on their parents' healthcare plans until Age 26.

That is why, with respect to *Texas v. United States*, Democrats offer H. Res. 6, which would: permit the Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, to intervene, otherwise appear, or take any other steps in any other cases involving the Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act, to protect the institutional interests of the House and to defend such act and the amendments made by such Act to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including the provisions ensuring affordable health coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

The title directs the Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives to represent the House in any such litigation and authorizes the Office of General Counsel to employ the services of outside counsel, including pro bono counsel, or other outside experts.

This is not an unprecedented action and in fact is contemplated by federal authority.

Rule 24 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure prescribe permissive intervention in a federal action by a government entity to vindicate a real interest.

The need to protect the healthcare interests of tens of millions of Americans—which was made possible, in part, by an act of this body, is a real interest as contemplated by Rule 24.

And this approach has bipartisan history.

As recently as 2011, when the Obama Administration refused to uphold the validity of the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act, which I did not support, House Republicans invoked Title III to hire outside counsel in defense of an ultimately unconstitutional bill—the first time the Supreme Court had ever ruled on the law's validity.

In contrast, in this case, the Affordable Care Act has withstood many legal challenges by the Supreme Court and has emerged from them intact.

The need to intervene in this case is informed by the millions of Americans whose peace of mind about their healthcare security is in doubt, including the countless Texans in my home state.

I urge my colleagues to approve H. Res. 6, and authorize intervention in this case, to vindicate the healthcare interests of tens of millions.

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, January 10, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 15

9:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SH-216

JANUARY 16

9:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To continue hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules for the 116th Congress.

SD-106

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine the future of nuclear power, focusing on advanced reactors.

SD-138

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S77–S109

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 60–72, and S. Res. 12–13. **Page S103**

Measures Passed:

Majority Party's Membership on Certain Committees: Senate agreed to S. Res. 12, to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen. **Page S87**

Minority Party's Membership on Certain Committees: Senate agreed to S. Res. 13, to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen. **Page S87**

Measures Considered:

Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, 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. **Pages S79–87, S87–99**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, January 10, 2019; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill occur at 1:45 p.m. **Pages S106–07**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2024.

Michael Graham, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2020.

Jennifer L. Homendy, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2024.

Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Geoffrey William Seiji Okamoto, of California, to be Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Page S109

Messages from the House:

Page S100

Measures Referred:

Page S100

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Page S101

Measures Read the First Time:

Page S101

Executive Communications:

Pages S101–02

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S102–03

Additional Cosponsors:

Page S103

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S103–06

Additional Statements:

Pages S99–S100

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S106

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:44 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 10, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S106–07.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 67 public bills, H.R. 356–422; 1 private bill, H.R. 423; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 23–24; and H. Res. 31–34, were introduced. **Pages H356–59**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H361**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Kelly (IL) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H291**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:02 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H298**

Oath of Office—Delegate from the Virgin Islands: Representative-elect Stacey E. Plaskett presented herself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. **Page H299**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 31, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H302**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, January 8th.

Clarity on Small Business Participation in Category Management Act of 2019: H.R. 226, to amend the Small Business Act to include best in class designations in the annual report on small business goals prepared by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 414 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 18.

Pages H311–12

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 32, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H312**

Adopting the Rules of the House for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress: The House agreed to Title III of H. Res. 6, adopting the Rules of the House for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, by a yeas-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 19. **Pages H338–46**

H. Res. 5, providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 6), the bill (H.R. 21), and the joint

resolution (H.J. Res. 1) was agreed to Thursday, January 3rd.

Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2019: The House passed H.R. 264, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, by a yeas-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 21. **Pages H312–38, H346–47**

Rejected the Graves (GA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yeas-and-nay vote of 200 yeas to 227 nays, Roll No. 20. **Page H337**

H. Res. 28, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 264), (H.R. 265), (H.R. 266), and (H.R. 267) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 17, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 16. **Pages H302–11**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yeas-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H310, H311, H311–12, H346, H346–47, and H347. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on President Trump's recent decision to withdraw U.S. forces from Syria, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, January 10

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, January 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bass, Karen, Calif., E24
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E25
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E25
Garamendi, John, Calif., E23
Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E24, E25

Hudson, Richard, N.C., E23
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E25, E26
King, Peter T., N.Y., E25
LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E24
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E25
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E23
San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E24

Schweikert, David, Ariz., E24
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E23
Titus, Dina, Nev., E23
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E23
Zeldin, Lee M., N.Y., E26



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