



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2019

No. 53

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 27, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM COSTA 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.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate Public Schools Week. It serves as a reminder that every child deserves access to quality education that helps them reach their full potential.

Public schools are where our students become citizens. They learn to think critically, solve problems, and build relationships. They grow to contribute to our society, our economy, and our communities, and it all starts

with the men and women who want to make a difference.

I want to thank our teachers and educators and professionals who work in these fields, and I want to include Ms. Lucy Gamby, who was my sixth grade teacher, and thank her for the influence that she had in my life. I am sure every one of us has someone like that that is that special teacher.

WORLD DOWN SYNDROME DAY

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, we celebrated Down Syndrome Day.

Many people don't know this, but they do know I have 11 grandchildren. My sixth grandchild and third grandson is Stanley. Stanley has Down's, and Stanley is an amazing, fun child, wonderful.

You know, it is kind of our job as grandparents to make sure that each grandchild believes that they are the favorite, and I do my best to do that, but today I want to recognize Stanley because I want to make sure that people understand that the people and the families that are involved and have Down syndrome children or grandchildren, that we live and we work to make sure that they can achieve to the highest level that they can in life. So this day I want to say, "Stanley, I love you."

We want to recognize all of our children who have Down's and our adults who have Down's and encourage them to be the best that they can be.

LIBERIAN IMMIGRANTS IN MINNESOTA NEED PEACE OF MIND

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking and thousands of Minnesotans are running out of time. Business owners are going to lose their workforce, workers are going to lose their jobs, and children are going to

lose their parents, and it will be because we here in Congress failed to take simple action when we were called to make change.

We have been handed a game-winning layup or, in Minnesota terms, an empty net, and all we have to do is tap in the puck. All we have to do is say to our Liberian population who came here fleeing bloody civil war and the terrors of the Ebola virus: You matter; you are doing everything right. The world took everything from you, and you came to our country. You work hard, legally, you pay your taxes, and you are valued members of our community.

But because we gave Liberians an immigration status DED, that does not allow a pathway to citizenship; and because that status expires now in 4 days, these friends, neighbors, and family members will be subject to deportation, and it will tear our community apart, and it will be on us.

Mr. Speaker, I recently heard from Nicole Mattson, a healthcare employer in senior care back in the Twin Cities: "We don't have enough workers. At my facility, 60 percent of employees are immigrants, and over half of those are Liberians. We would have to say goodbye to a pool of talent that is highly skilled and educated."

"I have no idea why we would leave behind such a critically important group of people to the healthcare industry. Very simply, we cannot do the work, we cannot care for people, we cannot care for seniors without them. We need them here, and we are glad they are here."

Mr. Speaker, I would say that we need courage to pass a legislative fix to save Minnesota's healthcare industry and keep hardworking members of our population home. I would say that we need courage to keep our families and communities and brothers and sisters together. This is so simple and so easy, that we do not even need courage. We just need to pass a bill.

□ 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.

H2831

These are immigrants who have done everything the right way: They are here legally; they work hard; they pay their taxes; and they have made themselves irreplaceable contributors to our communities.

Their immigration status has been extended by every President from Bill Clinton to Donald Trump. These would be undocumented citizens of our very own creation.

If you need the human argument, hear it from my constituent, Michael: "Going back to Liberia is not an option for me. My only brother, who we were not able to bring to America, died in Liberia a few years ago. My parents and siblings all live here in the United States."

"I was recently accepted into a doctoral program in education. My whole life is here. This is my home. Liberia is a fragile country still recovering from a decades-long war."

Or Matthew, who could lose his older brother: "It affects me deeply as a U.S. citizen. This is someone I look up to. If he was to up and leave the U.S., that would be very difficult for him, for me. He has a daughter. I cannot take on that responsibility of being my niece's caretaker."

"I cannot even imagine the nightmare that this will create in my community. This is not just about me and my family; it is about our community. We are going to be losing friends and family. I am not ready for this."

We have the legislation. We have a fix ready to go to move DED holders to TPS for 3 years while we pass a more comprehensive fix.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, ask yourselves: Are we here to make a difference? Are you here to make people's lives better? Are you here to help business owners and workers, or are you here to keep playing politics with people's lives?

Let's rise to the occasion and be better than that and finally, at long last, give our Liberian community the peace of mind that they so richly deserve.

KINETIC KIDS

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to spotlight Kinetic Kids, an organization in my hometown that helps more than 2,800 children with special needs in San Antonio, Schertz, and New Braunfels.

A few weeks ago, I joined over 470 Texans in the cold and the wet to support these local children with special needs.

In 2001, Kinetic Kids was founded by Tracey Fontenot and Kacey Wernli, pediatric physical therapists who saw that children with special needs needed more exercise. They needed motivation; they needed camaraderie; they needed the joy that comes from being part of a team.

I am proud to be part of their team, and I will always be here to cheer them on.

Congratulations on a great event, and thank you for the important work you do in the community.

FIGHTING THE BUREAUCRACY

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my team and I are committed to fighting the bureaucracy for folks I represent across the 23rd Congressional District of Texas who can't battle it on their own.

Recently, my team helped Kinney County in south Texas cut through Federal red tape to secure \$4 million in funding and spare the county from financial ruin. The county was being punished simply for following orders, but due to conflicting information from Washington bureaucrats regarding how much to pay employees at the county detention center, they were told they owed the Federal Government \$4 million.

Once my office heard about this issue, we worked relentlessly with the U.S. Marshals Service to ensure these costs were covered.

I thank Kinney County Judge Tully Shahan for informing me of this issue and the Department of Justice for working with my office to resolve this situation.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Joyce Meyer once said that "teachers can change lives with just the right mix of chalk and challenges."

For Amistad National Recreation Area Education Specialist Lisa Nielsen, her chalk is a trail, a shoreline, and a pair of binoculars. The 28-year National Park Service veteran has created several innovative and interactive programs that have educated tens of thousands of Texans I represent of all ages on the importance of conservation and maintaining our south and west Texas natural treasures for future generations to come.

I am proud to rise today to honor Lisa and all of the women who are making an impact each day across the 23rd Congressional District of Texas as we continue to celebrate Women's History Month.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise out of a deep concern for our country and its ability to sustain investments in growing our economy and making opportunities available for our people.

Our country suffered the longest government shutdown in its history just a few months ago. For 35 days, 800,000 Federal employees and their families were forced to go without paychecks. Our economy was burdened by uncertainty and a lack of confidence in our leaders.

That shutdown was the direct result of the Trump administration's confrontational approach to governing and its irresponsible decision to insist

on a position that Congress had already rejected.

I would have hoped that they learned from that experience, but it appears that that is not the case. Now President Trump and Mick Mulvaney—a former colleague of ours who voted not only to shut down the government, but against the wishes of the Republican Speaker, voted against opening government up—have sent to Congress a budget proposal that ramps up confrontation and sets up an even more difficult impasse.

Their budget proposal rejects 6 years of governing consensus enshrined in three 2-year budget agreements to raise the caps put in place by the Budget Control Act in a bipartisan way and according to the principles of parity, fairness, and equality.

Adhering to that path and working together to raise the caps responsibly and at the same rate for defense and nondefense investments would be, in my view, the best way to ensure that appropriations for next year proceed on a bipartisan basis so that we can do the job of funding the government and avert another unnecessary, dangerous, and harmful shutdown in October.

The administration's proposal of using the overseas contingency operations account to avoid negotiating with Congress on responsibly dealing with the BCA caps and hiding increases in defense funding is a massive gimmick.

Who said that? The Republican majority said that a number of years ago.

It is more than just an accounting sleight of hand, with real implications for our national security planning and long-term strategy.

The OCO account, again, overseas contingency operations account, was created to fund imminent defense priorities outside of the normal Pentagon budget planning cycle.

Now Mr. Mulvaney wants to use OCO at the rate of some \$175 billion-plus as if Afghanistan, in which we have been involved for some 17 years, is a contingency. It is not a contingency. It is an operating expense.

If OCO were used in the way the administration intends, it could cripple multiyear planning by our military by calling into question every penny shifted into that account in future years.

It is also disingenuous for them to demand that Congress pour money into defense through what Mr. Mulvaney himself has called a "backdoor slush fund." That is what he called OCO in 2015 when he was a Member of Congress.

And now that same Mr. Mulvaney, the Acting Chief of Staff and, frankly, I believe, also, the Acting OMB Director, proposes to use what he called a backdoor slush fund without acknowledging the need to compromise elsewhere on the ledger.

□ 1015

This is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst, because it is a veneer of concern

for fiscal discipline used to hide the ugly truth of fiscal recklessness and brinkmanship. The Trump-Mulvaney budget is, to put it bluntly, a fraud.

It is the Congress' job to move ahead with good faith efforts to agree on raising the caps. We have a procedure called sequester that, if we do not amend the caps, will go into effect 15 days after we adjourn this session and cut to levels that no Member of Congress, in my view, believes is reasonable, rational, or responsible. It would automatically occur if we do not pass a caps bill.

That is indicative that there is bipartisan agreement, which has happened over the last 6 years in 2-year cycles, that the caps required by the sequester bill were irrational. I think there is a consensus. So, as opposed to confrontation, and to avoid a shutdown in October, we ought to come to an agreement. The President, of course, needs to be part of that agreement, because he would need to sign legislation amending the sequester act.

Appropriators need guidance, also, to begin the hard work of writing funding bills. They need to know what the agreed spending level will be. We call it a 302(a). What it really means is: How much money are you going to spend on discretionary spending for defense and nondefense objectives?

Now, I am an appropriator. I haven't served on the committee for some years, because I am in the leadership, but I am on leave. I understand as well as anyone how important it is to have agreed-upon top-line numbers in order for the committee to do its work effectively on a bipartisan basis.

I will tell my Republican colleagues, as I have told my Democratic colleagues, it is my intention, as majority of the House of Representatives, to provide for the passage of the appropriations bills through the House of Representatives by the end of June.

The Budget Act requires us to do it by June 30. We have never done it. We haven't done it on our side; the Republicans haven't done it on their side. What inevitably happens is we don't get our work done, and we had a shutdown last year and this year of historic proportions and of historic cost and of historic undermining of confidence in the United States of America here and around the world.

We need to get to work; we need to get to work together; and we need to get this job done. Let's strive to achieve that which I know is achievable.

I have talked to Ms. GRANGER. I have talked to the ranking member of the Budget Committee here in the House, STEVE WOMACK, a good friend of mine. I have talked to Senator ENZI, the chairman in the Senate. And I have talked to Senator MCCONNELL. I haven't heard from anybody who doesn't think we need to get caps established so that we can do our work for the American people and reestablish confidence in the rational oper-

ations of the Congress. It won't be easy, but it is necessary.

Let us not delude ourselves into believing, just a few weeks removed from the longest government shutdown in our history, that the administration's shortsighted approach will lead to anything but another shutdown at the end of the fiscal year. Divided government need not be confrontational government.

I tell people on a regular basis that the Congress is less than the sum of its parts. What do I mean by that? I mean the individual Members have integrity and a willingness to work together, but, as a body, we have found ourselves unable or unwilling to do just that. We are less than the sum of our parts, less than the sum of our Members' intellect and willingness to act responsibly.

We can disagree on details, but we must try to reach agreement on the caps in order to assist appropriators, promote fiscal responsibility, reduce uncertainty, and protect the ability of our military to plan its budget over the long term with confidence.

If OCO is relied upon, in terms of billions of dollars, they cannot do that. It is undermining our national security, as well as undermining the ability to meet our domestic needs.

The Trump-Mulvaney budget proposal was, sadly, a missed opportunity and more of a fiscally irresponsible charade.

I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle: Let us strive to not miss our own opportunity to meet in good faith and produce a budget caps agreement that promotes fiscal sanity, upholds the principle of parity, and allows us to invest in a better future for our country. Certainly, we ought to expect no less of ourselves, and, certainly, that is what our constituents expect of us.

Then, let us proceed to achieve a realistic, fiscally responsible path toward a real, sustainable budget agreement worthy of our duty to our country and constituents and to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to come together, to reason together, and to establish a plan to proceed, not just for this year, but for a decade to come, that is fiscally responsible, meets the challenges that we have, and seizes the opportunities that are in front of us.

DIGNITY, OPPORTUNITY, AND AMERICAN VALUE OF WORK

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a large working-class family in central South Dakota. I suppose there were some years when we were more poor than we were working class. But I want to make it clear, my parents worked hard every single day. So did I, and so did my brother and my sisters.

Even with that hard work, there were times when we needed help from gov-

ernment to get by. I am who I am today because of the experiences of both welfare and hard work.

Government assistance can help meet people's basic needs. We all know that. But on its own, welfare alone means surviving just barely on the edges. Welfare can meet short-term basic needs, but education and work—yes, education and work—they deliver long-term hope and dignity and purpose and opportunity.

That brings me, today, to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. Many of us call it food stamps. I know this program well from a number of personal and professional experiences.

Most of you probably know that, under Federal law, able-bodied nonseniors—people between the ages of 18 and 50—who don't have children at home are required to work or train or volunteer or go to school for 20 hours a week to receive their benefits.

To most Americans, these work requirements are common sense, just as they were when they were passed, in 1986, into law in a bipartisan manner. They are common sense because work isn't punishment. Work is opportunity.

Unfortunately, over the years, some States have used gimmicks and loopholes to trigger waivers. Those waivers water down the work requirements that we have been talking about. These, I am sure, well-intentioned but misguided efforts, mean that one-third of our country lives in an area with no work requirements.

Today, despite a record-high 7 million job openings, we have 2.7 million SNAP recipients who can work but who aren't. There is a better way, I am happy to say, and I want to tell you about it.

A few years ago, because of State waivers, too many Arkansans were not experiencing the kind of dignity and opportunity that comes from work, so Arkansas changed course. They put their work requirements back into place, and the results were breathtaking. They were impressive.

People who left the program because they didn't work or didn't train or didn't volunteer ended up better off than they were on welfare. Necessity pushed them into a job path that brought them more resources than welfare alone could ever provide.

With all of those people moving off the welfare rolls and into the workplace, they were earning money, and the State saw its revenues go up.

That kind of success can, and is, happening elsewhere. When Maine reimplemented work requirements, incomes of former enrollees more than doubled and caseloads declined by 90 percent.

These results show all of us how important it is for us to close these loopholes. USDA Secretary Sonny Perdue should be commended for his efforts to do just that through a proposed rule, making sure that food stamp recipients are encouraged and rewarded for their work.

I want to make very clear, these actions are not about taking aid away from areas that are struggling with high unemployment. There are clear exceptions for those areas. Instead, this is about prompting more States and more citizens to experience the successes that have been experienced by Maine and by Arkansas.

We all know that every one of us does better, every single one of us does better, when we are pushed, when we are moved past our comfort level. Growth requires effort. That is true in athletics; that is true in academics; that is true in raising children; and that is true in all other areas of life as well. Denying millions of able-bodied SNAP recipients that push, that growth, also denies them a chance at a better future.

In States where work requirements have been reinstituted, a clearer path out of poverty has reemerged. We have to do that elsewhere. We have to do that everywhere.

I close today, Mr. Speaker, by saying that work has dignity; work is opportunity; and work is an American value.

CELEBRATING VAISAKHI

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Sikh community in celebrating Vaisakhi.

On April 14, Sikhs around the world, including thousands and thousands in California's San Joaquin Valley, will celebrate the Vaisakhi festival. This week, we welcome members of the Congressional Sikh Caucus to the Hill to participate in those celebrations.

The festival marks the new year and the beginning of the spring season for the global Sikh community.

The date of the Vaisakhi festival has tremendous significance in Sikhism. The festival commemorates the year 1699, when Sikhism emerged as a collective faith in what is now modern-day India.

It also celebrates both the birthday of the 10th Sikh guru, Guru Gobind Singh, and the foundation of the Khalsa Panth, the Sikh brotherhood.

Sikhs across the globe celebrate this day with enthusiasm and joy. I know they do in the rich San Joaquin Valley that is home to so many who are farmers, businesspeople, and community leaders. I have the honor to represent them and to celebrate with them.

This festival models what all cultures strive for: strong communities coming together to celebrate progress, renew its dedication to helping one another, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in celebrating this special tradition in the Sikh community.

WOMEN TRAILBLAZERS

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, every March, we come together to honor trailblazing women who have come be-

fore us, who have made a difference throughout the history of our country and throughout the world, and those who continue to pave the way for the next generation, those who have broken the glass ceiling, and those who are role models.

□ 1030

The unsung heroines of these courageous pioneering women continue to always make a difference.

The role model for me, and one who I must say made the incredible difference, was our mother, Lena Cordoza Costa, a daughter of immigrants, born before the Depression, raised during it, having to quit school as a freshman in high school to help raise her seven siblings because her father had been injured in an agricultural accident.

She went on with our father to be—as Tom Brokaw noted—perhaps America's greatest generation, striving with the values of hard work, of teaching us to treat others as we would want to be treated ourselves, and values of common sense.

As a young boy, learning that, Jim, you know, the truth is the truth, and that you should always never forget those who are less fortunate.

After our father passed away, my mother in her mid-70s quietly decided to go back to school and to get her GED. She didn't need to. She was a successful business person; she was an artist, a voracious reader, and a competitive bridge player.

And when she got her GED, she told my sister and me. We said, Mom, why didn't you tell us?

She says, Well, I wasn't sure I would do well.

Our mother did—everything that she did, she did well, and continued to serve as a role model.

Later on, the high school in which she had to quit as a freshman, at a 100th anniversary of that high school, asked her to come—with myself—and they presented her her high school diploma.

She was so proud of that high school diploma. And today, it sits on my desk. And I show students that you can be whatever you want to be if you have the proper role model and encouragement.

It is women who are guiding our Nation towards a more equal future—like our mother—who make a difference.

Today, I am proud to be a Member of the most diverse Congress in the United States' history, with over 102 women in this body, women serving the people's House.

We honor their sacrifice, their brilliance, and the strength of their service for our Nation.

JOE BIDEN: DECADES OF BEING WRONG

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, former Vice President Joe Biden has been in the

news a lot lately, along with a predictable narrative from the Washington know-it-all chorus and their mainstream media partners that he has a distinguished record and reputation as an expert on foreign policy.

How very "Washington" it is to assume that with his long Washington resume, especially his chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that Joe Biden is a foreign policy genius.

Nice guy that he is, let's look at the facts.

Because America's national security depends on America's wise choice of our next President, I want to quote the great Charles Krauthammer, who more accurately described Mr. Biden's record back in 2012.

The Vice President over the last 30 years holds the American record for being wrong on the most issues in Foreign Affairs ever. And the list starts with the nuclear freeze in the early eighties against Thatcher and Reagan, which is one of the follies of the era. He supported it.

He was against aid to the Nicaraguan Contras, which in the end brought democracy and ended the Sandinista rule at the time.

He was against Reagan's expansion of the defense budget, which bankrupted the Soviet Union and led to the end of the Soviet Empire.

He was against Reagan on strategic defenses, which is the big advantage that we have now in missile defense.

And look at where he was on Iraq. He opposed the first Iraq war, the Gulf war that liberated Kuwait, that everyone agrees was a good thing.

He supported the second Iraq war, which he, not I, say was a terrible mistake. And then when the surge happened, he opposed the surge in Iraq which rescued a losing war and ended in our leaving with our heads held high and some promise of the future.

He seems to be the Herbert Hoover of American foreign policy. And for him to be the spokesman for the Obama Administration on these affairs, I think is quite ironic.

It is not just conservative commentators who can see through the illusion of Vice President Biden's foreign policy judgment.

Robert Gates, former CIA director and Defense Secretary for George W. Bush and Barack Obama, had this to say about Biden in his book, "Duty: Memoirs of a Secretary at War":

"I think he has been wrong on nearly every major foreign policy and national security issue over the past four decades."

I rarely, if ever, agree with Barack Obama, and I am glad to see our country is now back on the road to a strong foreign policy. But I will give President Obama credit for wisely disregarding Vice President Biden's counsel on, arguably, the greatest achievement of Obama's presidency: his authorization in 2011 of the raid by America's SEAL Teams that killed Osama Bin Laden.

As Vice President Biden, himself, recalled to a group of Democrats in 2016, President Obama asked for a final recommendation from his national security team, and he asked, Joe, what do you think?

His answer was, Mr. President, my suggestion is, don't go.

Many agree that President Obama picked Biden as his Vice President in 2008 to quell concerns about his youth and lack of experience in Foreign Affairs, but in retrospect, it has now become clear that the most useful role he played was for Mr. Obama to take whatever he recommended and advised and conclude that it was probably the wrong approach.

Mr. Biden now believes that he is the right man to lead our Nation as President. America will choose a President in 2020, and I hope that Republicans and Democrats will conclude, as our 44th President and countless others have, that the opposite might just be true.

HEALTHCARE FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to go down a very tough, and for many families, humiliating journey down memory lane.

Memories full of sick mothers and fathers, sick children, and maybe even those who lost their life because they could not get affordable healthcare.

Apparently, this administration doesn't understand; for those of us who were here before the Affordable Care Act, the years and years of work, the thousands of pages of testimony, the many different committees—even my committee, the Committee on the Judiciary—we heard the pain and cries of those who did not have health insurance.

Maybe he doesn't know—the administration—the story of the 8-year-old girl whose family actually took her to the office of the insurance company—she had leukemia—to beg for coverage. And they denied her, and she died.

Maybe they did not hear the story of the mother whose son had hepatitis because he had not been able to overcome his drug addiction, even though he was a lawyer, and his only basis of healthcare was the emergency room in a city hospital;

Or maybe the doctor who drove to another city hundreds of miles away to get his intern son, put him in the backseat of his car and drive him all the way back so that he could be inside the jurisdiction in which his healthcare covered.

Maybe the administration and the President do not know about junk insurance policies, that when you get to the hospital, as they look over you in the emergency room and say, There is no room at the inn for you because your insurance doesn't cover hospitalization.

Or the tap on the door of your hospital room while you are in the bed, and although you are still ill, you are evicted because your insurance has capped.

All of that was eliminated with the Affordable Care Act.

What a disaster for this administration to proudly and arrogantly stand up to take a stand to destroy the Affordable Care Act in my State, in Texas v. Azar, and how sad it is that State officials from the moment they got elected in my State, Republicans, every day have been fighting to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

And my own county health department is begging for relief; begging for the expanded Medicaid; begging to serve the many thousands upon thousands that are in need who are working poor, but my State refused to accept the expanded Medicaid. And now, with great hubris, pompousness, this Government—it is supposed to be for the people, of which we are—has decided to take a stand to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

Rather than do what we are attempting to do as Democrats and protecting preexisting conditions and to expand and improve on healthcare, we are looking to lower health insurance premiums, strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions, stop insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans, and reverse the administration's healthcare, sabotaging needlessly driven-up premiums and uninsured rates and empower States to innovate and invest in enrolling more people.

Outreach. I have been engaged in outreach and education, and the families are excited when they are eligible for insurance.

All of the people that I mentioned, and some who died, had preexisting conditions. Over 50 percent of the American people—maybe upwards of 65 percent—have preexisting conditions.

In 2012, there were 45 million uninsured persons, but the Affordable Care Act was making its way so much so that we have reduced the amount of uninsured persons, as the numbers show in 2018, down to about 28 million, and we were making steady progress.

What kind of caring attitude do you have?

Where is your humanity, that you would take insurance away from sick children, families, and the elderly, and that you would allow their prescription drugs to shoot through the roof, which is what will happen when you destroy and implode the Affordable Care Act.

It is not an overnight success. 50 years America was trying to work on a system that would work, beyond the Medicare system, and Medicaid.

We are supporting—many of us—a way to provide healthcare for all, like Medicare for all. I am supporting this legislation, but what is happening in the administration is nothing but an implosion of a lifeline for the American people.

We need to stop that now.

CONGRATULATING WHEELING PARK HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH AND DEBATE TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Wheeling Park High School Speech and Debate Team, which has won the West Virginia State championship for 40 years in a row.

Think about that.

Their uninterrupted string of victories began when Jimmy Carter was President, and now has extended through the administrations of Presidents Reagan, Bush 41, Clinton, Bush 43, President Obama, and now President Trump.

Their winning streak is longer than most of my staff has been alive. Their 40-year record may very well be the longest in the country's history.

Their students are part of a dynasty. Some even have a personal family legacy because they are following the footsteps of their parents, who also won when they competed in the high school competition at Park.

Look, Generation Z suffers from a lot of negative stereotypes, but the team members on the Wheeling Park Speech and Debate Team are examples of a great new generation and what they can do.

These students are dedicated. They work year-round and compete in competitions to hone their skills. They are able to convey emotions and sway an audience while passionately arguing today's most pressing topics.

We couldn't be prouder of these students. There is no doubt in my mind, they have a bright future ahead of them, and that has everything to do with their work ethic and dedication.

I would also like to congratulate and thank their coaches, Bill Cornforth, Kayla Nelson, Isabella Droginske and Brigitte Mazure, as well as the team's founding coach, Fran Schoolcraft, who led them through their first 25 victories.

Congratulations on their first 40, and here's to the road to 41.

□ 1045

CONGRATULATING AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF CRITICAL-CARE NURSES

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses.

My wife, Mary, was a critical-care nurse for over 45 years and served as the past president of AACN. Her time as a critical-care nurse taught me how difficult it is to have a career in nursing.

It requires working long hours, weekends, and caring for people during the most challenging times of the patients' lives. And while sometimes nurses get to see happy endings, other times, they share in the emotions of families making very difficult decisions.

That is why it is important to honor the American Association of Critical-

Care Nurses, their dedication to their patients, and their push for excellence because, like their mission statement says, "Nothing less is acceptable."

CHILDCARE CRISIS

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about an important issue affecting families across our country, including in my home State of California.

I am a single mom, and I know firsthand that we have a childcare crisis in this country. Two years ago, I spent \$16,000 on childcare for my daughter Betsy to attend the U.C. Irvine-Verano Preschool. That is more than it would have been for an entire year of tuition for her to be an undergraduate at U.C. Irvine.

I was able to keep \$5,000 of the money that I earned pretax to go toward those childcare expenses in a flexible spending account, but that didn't go very far to cover childcare for Betsy, never mind my other two children. The \$5,000 doesn't even get me to tax day. This is the reality of raising a family in Orange County and in so many places across the country.

In only one State is childcare considered affordable. Let that sink in. In every State but one, the majority of families have to spend more than 7 percent of their income on childcare.

My constituents in the 45th Congressional District have asked me to help them make childcare affordable.

Jennifer, who works in my district, has two children under the age of 3. She and her husband will spend 23 percent of their gross income on childcare next year. That is not affordable.

In Irvine, Erica and her husband spend \$1,350 each month for childcare for their 3-year-old son. They have access to a flexible spending account through their employer, but the \$5,000 that current law allows only covers 31 percent of their annual childcare cost.

Even for those with school-age children, the most affordable city-sponsored camps so parents can work during the summer and spring break, exceed \$5,000. And the cost of eldercare is equally out of proportion to the current \$5,000 limit on the Dependent Care Flexible Spending Account.

That is why I am introducing the bipartisan Family Savings for Kids and Seniors Act. This bill will allow families to keep more of their own paychecks, pretax, to use for the care for kids, grandparents, and other family members that they incur so that they can work. The bill does this by adjusting the limit that Americans can put into their Dependent Care Flexible Spending Accounts, or FSAs. Families use this pretax benefit to help pay for preschool, camps, adult daycare, and childcare.

The \$5,000 limit under current law has not changed since it was enacted in 1986, but childcare costs have certainly

risen with the cost of inflation. There is no reason why a family's ability to save for dependent care shouldn't have increased with time as well.

If my bill were in effect now, families would be able to put \$11,300 in their flexible savings accounts. That is about the average cost of childcare for one child in this country.

The Family Savings for Kids and Seniors Act offers families a way to keep more of what they earn to pay for the childcare and eldercare that allows them to work. The work that parents do adds to the vitality and the strength of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting America's working families.

RECOGNIZING GRACE BIBLE CHURCH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a faith community in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, that truly embodies the virtues of kindness and charity. Grace Bible Church in Souderton, will be hosting its sixth annual Easter dinner, where all members of our community are welcome.

Like last year, Grace Bible Church will be offering transportation to residents of Grundy Manor in Telford and Valley Vista in Souderton so that they are able to participate in an evening of food and fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to all of the congregants of Grace Bible Church for opening their doors to our neighbors and for living out their Christian faith in their actions.

I would like to particularly thank and recognize one of the event's organizers, Carol Doyle, for her work, along with Pastor Dave Dunbar for his vision and for his leadership.

RECOGNIZING ALAN HARTL IN HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the retirement of a true professional and advocate in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, after his nearly 40 years of providing mental health counseling and recovery services to members of our community.

Alan Hartl will be stepping down as the chief executive officer of the Lenape Valley Foundation after a long and distinguished career. A psychologist, Alan has, for decades, been a strong advocate for those with behavioral health needs.

Widely respected throughout Bucks County and among his peers, Alan is a member of the board of directors of both the National Council for Behavioral Health and the Pennsylvania Rehabilitation and Community Providers Association.

Alan's dedication to improving the lives of our neighbors and his delivering hope to those most in need are truly admirable. I wish him all the best

in his new chapter, and I wish his successor, Sharon Curran, all of the best in her new role.

RECOGNIZING CAROLANN BEGLEY FOR HER WORK TO PREVENT HUNGER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding school administrator in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, who was recently recognized by a national nonprofit organization for her work to prevent hunger amongst our community students.

Carolann Begley, nutrition services area supervisor at North Penn High School, was named a Breakfast Hero by the organization, No Kid Hungry.

Carolann's work has been instrumental in making breakfast more accessible to students, notably through her work to implement a breakfast cart for the 2018-2019 school year.

Mr. Speaker, our community school administrators and educators work tirelessly to give our students the resources they need to pursue their goals. I applaud Carolann for her service, and I would also like to thank North Penn High School Principal Pete Nicholson and the No Kid Hungry network, an organization, for all of the work that they do for our community.

COMMEMORATING THE FIGHTIN' FIFTY-FIFTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the longstanding bond our Midwest communities enjoy with the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth Wing, the United States Air Force wing right here at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska. It has units all over the world.

The 55th Wing and the 55th Wing Association will jointly celebrate a uniquely treasured relationship at this year's reunion in April that will feature numerous dedications and commemorative events.

The Fightin' Fifty-Fifth's historic lineage began before World War II. Since 1940, the unit has distinguished itself as a preeminent Air Force organization, flying and supporting worldwide operations in peace and conflict. Of note, the 55th Fighter Group conducted fighter sweeps over the invasion beaches on June 6, 1944, using their P-38s. In 1966, the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth transferred to Nebraska as part of the Strategic Air Command.

For over 50 years, the 55th Wing personnel have supported national interests around the world, focusing on providing first-class reconnaissance, real-time intelligence, command and control, information warfare, and combat support capabilities. It is the largest wing in Air Combat Command and flies the most diverse types of aircraft.

Notably, since Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, the 55th Wing is the only Air Force wing with continuous operations, maintenance, and aircraft presence in

the United States Central Command theater of operations.

Indeed, the sheer longevity of this storied unit's history and global mission reach personifies their motto, "The Sun never sets on the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth."

The unit's exceptional record of service was the catalyst for the 55th Wing Association's creation. Following decades of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth camaraderie, global deployments, and operational achievement, a handful of veteran aviators were determined to preserve this invaluable heritage so it would not be lost to future generations.

This innovative initial cadre formed the 55th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing Association to serve alongside the Offutt's 55th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing Active-Duty force. Both organizations were eventually renamed to today's 55th Wing and 55th Wing Association, respectively, and have remained in Nebraska ever since.

The 55th Wing Association is comprised of Air Force veterans who served honorably in the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth, most of whom were stationed at Offutt Air Force Base. The 55th Wing Association's support to their Active-Duty counterparts is second to none, and its support to the 55th Wing alumni is a model for other Air Force organizations to emulate. It embodies the impressive relationship between alumni veterans and Active-Duty military members, and they have it in their credo, "Honoring those who served, and serving those who do." It could not be said any better.

This bond between veteran citizens and military personnel is nothing short of remarkable. These organizations demonstrate the very best of cooperation to serve our national interests, sustain organizational values, and foster military fellowship from as far back as those who served in World War II to those of the present who still fly, fight, and win our Nation's battles right now. Their relationship will forever be enshrined at the many ceremonies in Nebraska on April 6, where monuments will be dedicated to the alumni of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth past, present, and future.

In 2003, the 55th Wing Association captured the inspirational essence of their history in choosing the following inscription on their U.S. Air Force Museum monument, and it says:

We must never forget that freedom is never really free; it is the most costly thing in the world. And freedom is never paid in a lump sum; payments come due in every generation. All any of us can do is to offer the generations that follow a chance for freedom.

The 55th Wing Association also chose these same words for inclusion on the monuments they will dedicate this April. They are fitting praise for the accomplishments of the past and a challenge to the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth for the future.

Just 11 days ago, Nebraska was hit with the worst national disaster in the

history of our State and a third of Offutt Air Force Base was damaged, including key operations and support facilities. The Fightin' Fifty-Fifth never missed a beat supporting operations all over the world. This indomitable spirit of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth led the Secretary of the Air Force, Heather Wilson, to say: "Not even Mother Nature could defeat the 55th Wing."

So, after 75 years as an organizational flying wing, over a half century based in Nebraska, and more than 25 consecutive years deployed in the Middle East for combat operations, the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth deserves our highest respect, and I am honored to salute the 55th Wing Association for all of its efforts to preserve its rich heritage.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL CRAIG OSBORNE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colonel Craig Osborne, a soldier in my district who will be retiring this week after 30 years of service in the United States Army.

Colonel Osborne graduated from Illinois State University in 1989 as a distinguished military graduate, and during his time with the Army, he has participated in a total of five combat deployments: Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, Operation Joint Guard, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Time and time again, Colonel Osborne has answered the call to serve his country. He has served at the headquarters of Allied Land Forces Southeastern Europe in Turkey, as well as the chief of staff for a combined, joint, and interagency task force in Kabul, Afghanistan.

□ 1100

In his current position with the National Defense University, he contributes to the education of future generations of our servicemembers.

Among his many distinctions, Colonel Osborne has earned three Defense Superior Service Medals, the Legion of Merit, five Bronze Star Medals, three Defense Meritorious Service Medals, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and numerous other awards.

Words cannot express how thankful I am for Colonel Osborne's service. He is a great example of someone who has dedicated his life to serving his country, and I am proud to honor him today.

Congratulations on your retirement, Colonel.

REMEMBERING GARY JONES

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember Gary Jones, a good friend and dedicated police officer who passed away earlier this month after a long battle with cancer.

Gary and I both grew up in Taylorville, Illinois. After graduation, he went on to serve in the Army and in the Army National Guard. He eventually became a police officer in our hometown. He was proud of his job and always loved going to schools to teach students about the police station and his job protecting our community.

Outside of work, Gary's greatest hobby was firearms. He was a gunsmith, a proud member of the NRA, a master firearms instructor, and my and my wife's concealed carry instructor. Gary loved teaching people about the responsibility of owning firearms and teaching people the importance of gun safety.

I will remember Gary as a true example of patriotism and service to our community that we share as a hometown. He made a tremendous impact on the lives of many in Taylorville, and he will truly be missed.

My prayers are with his wife, Gina; their four children, Logan, Kaylee, Tanner, and Dylan; and all those like me who were blessed to know Gary Jones.

SLOW DOWN TO PROTECT FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a dangerous, disturbing, and unacceptable trend in Illinois and across the country. It is the rising number of first responders being struck by drivers.

We are not even 3 months into this year, and 14 members of the Illinois State Police have been struck by drivers while on the road or responding to incidents. These accidents have resulted in one fatality and more than a dozen injuries.

Our first responders put their lives on the line every day to protect us, and it is inexcusable to have this number of them injured by errant and distracted drivers. These numbers average out to more than one trooper struck per week and is nearly double the number of incidents in all of 2018.

Even though every State has laws requiring drivers to change lanes or slow down when vehicles or emergency personnel are on the side of the road, these tragedies keep occurring. For the safety of our first responders, construction workers, and tow truck drivers, please slow down, avoid distractions, and be alert on the road to help save lives and buck this tragic trend.

MOTORCYCLE COMMUNITY PROFILING

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

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the issue of motorcycle profiling.

This week, I joined Congressman BURGESS, my fellow co-chair of the Congressional Motorcycle Caucus, to introduce a resolution that encourages

greater collaboration between the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

There is no doubt, motorcycles represent more than just a mode of transportation to those of us who ride them. They often signify a sense of freedom, identity, and camaraderie. In Michigan, we have thousands of local riders and many more who come from out of State to enjoy our Great Lakes, scenic highways, and the great outdoors.

As an avid motorcyclist myself, I have heard from many in the riding community who felt that they had been profiled by law enforcement at least once, oftentimes solely because of their motorcycle-related apparel. While I certainly support actions taken to enforce violations of the law, we should all be concerned about profiling of riders based on their attire and absent any wrongdoing.

To be clear, motorcyclists have a deep appreciation for our Nation's law enforcement officers. We understand the difficulties they face on a daily basis, and we are not disparaging that in any way. Our resolution simply seeks to bring increased awareness and encourage a cooperative effort to address an issue that affects many of our constituents in the motorcycle community.

By having an open dialogue, I hope we can foster a greater understanding of the issues surrounding motorcycle profiling and ensure our roads and highways are safe for all to enjoy.

RECOGNIZING THE MAITLAND FAMILY

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim and Cheri Maitland of Jackson, Michigan. The Maitlands recently made history by becoming the first family to visit all 418 national parks and units. From Alaska to the River Raisin National Battlefield Park in Monroe, Michigan, they have logged more than 300,000 miles over the span of 8 years. The Maitland children, Jamison and Gerald, each have an impressive collection of Junior Ranger badges from learning about all the parks.

The family earned the nickname the "Parkbound Maitlands" after watching a documentary series on America's national parks, which then sparked a desire on their part to see the beauty across our great land.

When the Maitlands are not exploring in their RV, you might find them volunteering at River Raisin National Battlefield Park in Monroe, Michigan. It is a wonderful park and destination in our community where the family has spent more than 1,000 volunteer hours.

Their philosophy is to leave each park a little bit better than how they found it.

Madam Speaker, I share the Maitlands' love of the outdoors and our national park system. This is truly a remarkable accomplishment and one that makes me pretty jealous.

Congratulations to the Maitland family on your incredible journey. I am

grateful for your commitment to keeping our parks in pristine shape.

PROMISE OF AMERICA

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the promise of America.

What is the promise of America? What has it meant for us? And what does it mean for us today?

America has been around for a few hundred years. That is really not that long. In that short time, our dreams have informed the imaginations of people around the globe.

It all started when our Founding Fathers drafted and signed the Declaration of Independence. It set us on a path for our Nation to be the greatest experiment in self-governance that the world has ever known. Our Founders were our first innovators who risked it all for America to be free.

I am sure there are times when we have fallen short, but our experiment has been overwhelmingly for the good. It is here in America that we have led and cultivated history's greatest breakthroughs. We fought a war to end slavery. We liberated Europe from the Nazis. We invented flight; put men on the Moon; split the atom; and invented the microchip, the internet, and more.

At great expense, all this was accomplished by maintaining fleets and armies for America to be a beacon of hope for freedom-loving people around the world. We have done more to lift people out of poverty and raise the standard of living than any nation in the history of the world.

Madam Speaker, I am sure our Founders never dreamed that any of this would be possible, but it was because they made their vision for America a reality rooted in the promise that our rights are self-evident, sacred, and undeniable.

America was born with purpose. It says it right here in the Declaration of Independence. We all know the words, or at least we should know the words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

These are more than just words. It is a faith statement, a distinctive national credo. The moment we fail to believe it, the experiment is over and this Nation will fade away like all nation-states that have lost belief in themselves and forgotten their identity.

If we forget our purpose and let the promise of America be broken, then we are lost. The future is lost.

It is our job and our highest responsibility to transmit the promise of America to our children and to all who are a part of this great experiment. It is not enough that we merely assert these

as ideas. We must live them as truths and show the world that they work.

America is where freedom has made its greatest mark. It is where creativity is unmatched by any time in history. It is where justice flowers more generously than anyplace on Earth.

The torch must be passed to the next generation. That is what President John F. Kennedy said, and, Madam Speaker, we must do just that.

I will keep coming back to this floor, to the people's House, to make this case that the promise of America is for every person in our country.

There is a battle going on right now for the heart and soul of America, so it is worth repeating that we must never forget our purpose. That is what unites us as Americans, and it is where I find hope that we can come together around shared values that built our great Nation.

I am committed more than ever to restore trust and confidence in the promise of America. It is a promise that will keep us free, empower our children in the next generation to shine, and strengthen the moral fabric where our identity rests.

CELEBRATING 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF 28TH INFANTRY DIVISION OF U.S. ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 28th Infantry Division of the United States Army National Guard as it recently celebrated the anniversary of its 140th year of serving this Nation.

Its roots in American history were planted long before our Nation's founding. The 28th Infantry's lineage traces all the way back to when Benjamin Franklin formed a militia known as the Pennsylvania Associators. The first meeting of the Associators occurred on November 21, 1747. Franklin organized units to defend the city of Philadelphia against the French and Spanish privateers.

The 28th Infantry Division is the oldest continuously serving division in the United States Army. It wasn't until 1879 when the 28th ID was officially established by Governor Henry Hoyt and designated a red keystone as its symbol.

Throughout history, the 28th Infantry Division has answered our country's call to serve in nearly every war. The 28th ID soldiers fought side by side in the Spanish-American War. They earned the nickname "Iron Division" in the First World War by General John Pershing after a chivalrous stand in France. This decorated division still goes by this storied nickname.

The infantrymen stepped ashore at Omaha Beach and were the first American division to parade through Paris

after its liberation. They were also deployed for duty during the Korean war. In present day, its operations have continued in places like Bosnia, Kosovo, Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

I had the distinct pleasure of meeting these members of the 28th Division last November in Kuwait, joining them in the mess hall for Thanksgiving dinner. The division stationed in Kuwait was part of Operation Spartan Shield. This operation sought to strengthen U.S. partnerships in the Middle East and support ongoing operations to defeat ISIS.

Just a few weeks ago, I got to reunite with the 28th ID in Hershey, Pennsylvania, to celebrate the 140th anniversary. The dinner and ceremonies were a fitting tribute for a historic part of the United States military.

Madam Speaker, these men and women continue to build upon the Iron Division legacy. They are brave, resilient, and well-trained to support each other in combat and defend our great Nation.

So I say to the men and women of the 28th Infantry Division: Roll on, 28th. Roll on.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the 28th Infantry Division for 140 years of service, sacrifice, and valor.

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 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Send us Your spirit, enlighten the hearts of the Members of this people's House. Uphold all of our commitments to live according to Your revealed truths and the constitutional law of this great Nation.

Let freedom flourish in the lives of Your people who seek justice and prove themselves trustworthy.

Shape virtuous leadership in government at every level. May all citizens know with confidence the diligence of their representatives, and may this body prove creative in facing the issues of the day.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMALFA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ASSYRIAN NEW YEAR

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to wish the Assyrian community in the Central Valley and across the world a Happy New Year.

One of my fondest memories growing up in Turlock was spending afternoons with my Assyrian neighbor, who was like a grandmother to me. Her name was Nana Bitpera.

Every day, she would pick grape leaves in her backyard while she made rice, so my brother and I could enjoy fresh, homemade dolmas after school.

She would tell me stories about the incredible contributions of the Assyrian culture to art and literature: how Assyrians built the first human cities, were the first to domesticate crops, and how they literally invented the wheel.

She also told me about the centuries of persecution that Assyrians faced that caused so many to come for a new future in America.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate the year 6769, I want to tell the Assyrian community how grateful I am to be their neighbor, and may this new year bring their families joy and happiness.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern with the inappropriately and euphemistically named "Paycheck Fairness Act." In reality, this legislation should be called the "Leave No Lawyer Behind Act."

I am sure everyone in this room believes that equal work deserves equal

pay. In fact, Congress passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963 to ensure that. But that is not what Democrats have put this legislation on the floor for. Instead, they wanted something to benefit trial lawyers and to make it nearly impossible for job creators to defend against frivolous, unlimited lawsuits.

In fact, this legislation is actually harmful to women in the workforce by creating a mandatory opt-out system for class action lawsuits that will ultimately limit legal options when there actually is workplace discrimination.

This legislation is all about litigation, and that is not right. Enforce existing laws effectively. That will protect women, and everyone, in the workplace.

The number of working women in the U.S. is higher than ever—nearly 75 million—with more women entering the workforce in the last 2 years than men. That is the type of fairness we should continue to strive for.

I support policies that help more women become their own boss, not unlimited paydays for trial lawyers.

WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME COMMEMORATIVE COIN

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, in honor of the final week of Women's History Month, I am proud to join a group of bipartisan colleagues in introducing the National Women's Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act.

As the National Women's Hall of Fame celebrates its 50th anniversary, this will help ensure the financial viability and longevity of this iconic historical landmark for years to come.

I am especially pleased that our very own Louise Slaughter will be inducted into the hall of fame this year: a fitting tribute for one of the most inspiring women I have had the privilege of knowing.

Louise will take her place alongside some of our Nation's trailblazers in the city that forever altered the course of women's rights in our Nation.

I am delighted that this legislation will help ensure that Louise, and so many other remarkable women in the hall of fame, will continue to inspire generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to diligently working toward its passage, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(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, I rise today to advocate for an appropriation request I have put forward to provide adequate funding to the Social Security Administration.

Social Security enables millions of Americans to make ends meet, including retired and disabled workers, and the families of deceased workers. It is a program that working folks have been paying into their entire working lives.

Despite the agency's effectiveness, funding cuts have created a massive, and in some cases life-threatening, backlog.

The national average wait time for a Social Security Disability Insurance benefits hearing is 535 days. And last year, Philadelphia, in my State, had the longest average wait time in the country: 26 months. One West Philadelphia woman with multiple sclerosis waited 878 days before getting a favorable ruling.

Given this reality, I am truly alarmed that, rather than fully funding Social Security, the President's budget is consistently hundreds of millions of dollars less than what Congress enacted the previous year.

This sums up why people are fed up with Washington: powerful politicians keeping everyday Americans from the benefits they have earned. The injustice needs to stop. We must stand with working families and help them obtain their benefits.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.RES. 124, OPPOSING BAN ON TRANSGENDER MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 252 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 252

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, 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 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 Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-8 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a

substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 124) expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), 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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1215

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, on Monday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 252, providing for consideration of two bills: H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act; and H. Res. 124, expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7 under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It self-executes a manager's amendment. It also makes in order nine amendments.

The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 124 under a closed rule, and it provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Madam Speaker, 56 years ago, President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act. He referred to this law as a "structure basic to democracy"—equal pay for equal work, in essence, equality. But the sad reality is that, over 56 years later, women are still paid less than their male counterparts for the same work. I know, because it happened to me.

One of my first jobs was in a male-dominated industry selling steel. It didn't matter if I performed as well, if not better, than my male colleagues; I was still paid less. I had to leave that job, which I loved, because I wasn't getting my fair share. It was a shame then, and it is a shame now.

In the sixties, women made 60 cents on the dollar. Now the average woman makes 80 cents compared to her male counterpart—80 cents. For women of color, the gender wage gap is even more severe:

For every dollar made by her non-Hispanic White male counterpart, an African American woman makes 61 cents, a Native American woman makes 58 cents, and women who look like me, Latinas, make 53 cents on the dollar for similar work. That is less than the average woman made in the 1960s.

Do I not work just as hard as my male counterparts?

Do I deserve to make 53 cents on the dollar?

Do I not have to support my household as much as a man?

Latinas lose, on the average, \$28,386 every year. That amounts to more than \$1 million over her career.

What would an extra \$1 million mean for the working woman or for her children? That she never has to choose between paying for childcare or buying groceries or not worrying about how to send her kids to college. Maybe she could even fulfill the American Dream of purchasing a home.

Some people brush this off by arguing that women choose different or easier jobs than men, like being a teacher or a nurse. To those people, I ask: Who sets those salaries? When was the last time you were underpaid to teach 40 children in a classroom setting?

Nursing assistants each suffer roughly three times—three times—the rate of back and other injuries as construction workers. Are you going to tell me that the nurse who spends 12 hours on her feet taking care of those most in need doesn't deserve higher pay, or the 911 dispatcher who is working the graveyard shift, fielding call after call after call, coordinating an effective emergency response so that they themselves can save lives or the first responders can save lives?

Don't tell me women's work is easier. We need equality—in practice, not just in law.

H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act will make equal pay a reality. It addresses the many complicated facets of sex-based discrimination.

Even when it is crystal clear, it is incredibly difficult to win a lawsuit to prove that employers are discriminating on the basis of sex. The Paycheck Fairness Act requires employers to demonstrate that wage disparity is based on a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.

In workplaces where women are empowered to know how much they are making compared to their male colleagues, the gender gap shrinks by 7 percent; however, some workplaces penalize employees for discussing their salaries. The Paycheck Fairness Act would prevent retaliation against employees for wage transparency.

Sex discrimination causes women to make 6.6 percent less than equally qualified male counterparts on their first job. Over time, as raises and bonuses are decided based on a woman's prior salary history, this gap is made even worse. The Paycheck Fairness Act prevents employers from asking for a salary history.

Another factor that contributes to gender pay disparity is that women are less likely to negotiate for a higher salary. Studies show that men are expected to negotiate, but when women ask for more money, they are penalized and still paid less. The Paycheck Fairness Act creates a grant program to fund negotiation and skills training.

Currently, employees must opt in to class action lawsuits brought under the Equal Pay Act, running contrary to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This makes it more difficult for women to use the courts to correct equal pay disparities. The Paycheck Fairness Act allows them to opt out, removing barriers to participate in class action lawsuits and, therefore, addressing systematic gender-based inequality.

I have offered two amendments to the Paycheck Fairness Act bill to highlight the serious effects of the gender pay gap on women of color.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a step in the right direction. Women who look like me should not make 53 cents on the dollar for the same work as our White male colleagues, and even less than the average woman made 60 years ago. It is wrong, and it is unjust. That is why it is crucial we pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Now, I would like to turn your attention to H. Res. 124, expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly gay transgender individuals.

For me, this issue hits close to home. I am a proud mother of an Air Force veteran.

It wasn't a decision they made lightly. It was one made with great personal sacrifice, and the U.S. Government made a promise to them that they would be safe to be themselves.

Imagine how their mothers and fathers must feel knowing that our Na-

tion has broken a promise to their children. This doesn't make us safer.

We should welcome every qualified person who is willing to stand up to deploy and enlist in our Armed Forces to serve alongside people like my son.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation seeks to prevent wage discrimination on the basis of sex, but this is already prohibited under current law.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a false promise made by the majority that would not provide the outcomes that we all seek as Americans. This legislation will empower trial lawyers and offers no new protections against pay discrimination.

According to the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Federal law currently prohibits all discrimination in pay or other employment practices based upon sex or any other nonjob-performance-related issue.

In 1964, Congress enacted comprehensive antidiscrimination civil rights protection based on race, color, national origin, religion, and sex under title 7 of the Civil Rights Act.

Together, these laws protect against sex discrimination and provide a range of remedies for victims. As a result, sex-based wage disparity is in direct violation of not one, but two current Federal laws.

It is important to acknowledge that there are bad actors. A small number of managers may practice pay discrimination, but their actions are illegal, and this opens their businesses to lawsuits and to heavy fines.

I could not agree more that such discrimination has no place in those businesses or in society in general. However, those who perpetuate these illegal acts are the exception and not the rule.

Congress must not ignore the positive trends our Nation has seen in the last 26 months:

Since 2017, the Trump administration has made significant strides in reining in Federal overreach, improving opportunities and results for Americans in the past 2 years;

The Tax Cut and Jobs Act has given all Americans greater opportunity, regardless of sex, leading to an improved economy;

Unemployment is at its lowest level in nearly half a century;

Median wages across all demographic groups are rising faster now than at any time in recent history.

According to a recent Wall Street Journal article, the United States economy added jobs for 100 consecutive months. The current labor market is not only benefiting the low-skilled services, but also high-skilled workers and those with advanced degrees.

In both low-skill and high-skill sectors, there remains a short supply of willing or qualified workers, driving up wages for both. Across the spectrum, all workers are benefiting from the current economy.

Our former colleague Jack Kemp used to describe a situation where "a rising tide lifts all boats." We may very well be in that "rising tide" period.

But despite the good news, the majority has crafted legislation that would place a greater burden on employers and reduce the privacy of employees and increase Federal spending.

H.R. 7 does little to protect the wages of American workers. In fact, it makes it harder for employers to defend legitimate differentials in pay.

Currently, employers may pay different wages due to factors other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.

Let's say that again. Under current law, you must pay equal wages for equal work. That means all other things being equal, a woman cannot be paid differently than a man.

When an employee brings different qualifications to the job, such as an advanced degree or more years of experience, the factors used to evaluate employee pay are no longer equal. This preserves the flexibility for employers to make the best decision for their business, including hiring the most qualified employees, regardless of their gender.

□ 1230

H.R. 7 would now require that non-sex reasons for any wage disparity would have what is termed a "business necessity." Now, "business necessity," this is a term that goes undefined in the legislation. Proving a gender-based business necessity that accounts for the entire differential in pay is sometimes a nearly impossible standard to defend.

Employers would no longer be able to hire or pay employees based on qualifications, unless that qualification is being one sex or the other, a standard that is defined in very few jobs. In addition, employers would not be able to consider market or economic factors of their particular business sector that might account for a wage disparity.

This change to what is called a "bona fide factor defense" does not take into account the reality of the labor market. Employees are often willing to accept lower pay for greater control over their work location, their schedule, or how they aggregate their leave. Studies have shown this is particularly true for women, but it is also true for men.

With the threat of a lawsuit hanging over the heads of employers, they are less likely to allow for flexibility in the workplace. Instead of allowing employees to negotiate their own pay and their work arrangements, employers will be incentivized to transform jobs that were once negotiable and flexible into jobs where one size must fit all.

H.R. 7 also limits an employer's ability to pay its employees based on performance. If a woman were to earn a performance-based bonus or salary that her male coworker did not receive, that man could file a suit against the employer on the basis that the bonus is not a business necessity, due to the vagueness of the term in H.R. 7.

With this threat in mind, employers may be less likely to use performance-based pay and bonuses, despite studies showing such pay models actually increase employee pay. As approximately 40 percent of employers now use performance-based compensation, this bill and the vague definitions in this bill could potentially lead to a stagnation or a decrease in wages.

Under current law, employers are prohibited from pay discrimination whether it is intentional or not. If such pay discrimination is intentional, employees can sue the employer in a class action suit for up to \$300,000 in compensatory and punitive damages.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would remove the threshold to this liability and would require that workers be included in class action lawsuits. It would require that they be included in class action lawsuits unless they opt out, but many people may not be aware of that requirement that they must opt out. Otherwise, they are automatically included.

In addition, there are no limits on the fees charged by trial lawyers. There were amendments offered at the Rules Committee hearing to do just that, but they were not accepted as part of this rule.

One of those amendments, in fact, limited the compensation for litigation attorneys to \$2,000 per hour. That was the cap placed on attorneys' fees, \$2,000 an hour. That is a phenomenal sum of money. It was rejected by the Rules Committee. Apparently, they felt that their litigation attorneys were worth more than \$2,000 an hour or are required to earn more than \$2,000 an hour in order to put food on the table for their families. It just doesn't make sense. There should be reasonable limitations on those fees.

While legitimate claims do exist, and I hope that all employees who have experienced discrimination seek a legal remedy, the changes in H.R. 7 would significantly increase the size and the profitability of lawsuits, making unnecessary lawsuits even more likely for trial lawyers looking for new cash flows.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would also have a substantial impact on the rights of both employers and employees. The bill would prohibit employers from requesting information regarding an employee's pay history, which is likely an unconstitutional limit on the employer's freedom of speech.

Furthermore, the bill reduces the right to privacy for employers and employees as it removes any recourse should an employee make public the wages of other employees, even with-

out the consent of those employees or their employer.

H.R. 7 also requires employers to provide disaggregated employee information to the Department of Labor without delineating mechanisms to keep that information safe.

We saw just that last week with the Federal Emergency Management Agency data breach. The government is not always the best steward of a citizen's private information, and we should limit the data received by agencies until those capabilities are improved and verified.

Let me be clear: Wage discrimination certainly has no place and is illegal in the United States of America. But I believe this bill places undue and unnecessary restrictions on otherwise lawful business practices and is based upon unsubstantiated findings. Therefore, I cannot support H.R. 7.

The path that Congress must take is not to increase opportunities for trial lawyers but to continue focusing on strong economic policy that expands opportunities for all Americans.

Last year, 2.8 million jobs were added to the United States' economy. Fifty-eight percent of those jobs were taken by women. Nearly 75 million women are participating in the workforce today, more than at any time in our Nation's history. A robust and resilient economy will provide the jobs and wage gains Americans expect and deserve.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleague from Texas that the women in Texas make \$0.72 to their male counterparts. I think Texas women deserve to have equal pay.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, long overdue legislation to close the gender wage gap and ensure equal pay for equal work.

Too many Americans are not making enough to make ends meet, living paycheck to paycheck. We need to focus on strategies to raise family incomes. H.R. 7 does just that.

H.R. 7 would limit pay secrecy, expand pay data collection, and create more employer accountability for pay differences. This legislation will build upon and improve the work of President Kennedy, who signed the Equal Pay Act, and President Obama, who signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Despite the progress we have made over the last 50 years, women are still earning less than their male counterparts across age, race, and socioeconomic groups. This stubborn wage gap, often exacerbated by employer-imposed pay secrecy policies, makes it

clear that we must be intentional in our efforts to address persistent pay disparity.

On average, women working full time lose a combined total of more than \$900 billion every year due to the wage gap. If the annual gender gap were closed, a working woman would have enough money for an additional 13 months of childcare, a year of college tuition, more than 1 year's worth of food, or an additional 10 months of rent.

Equal pay is not simply a women's issue. It is a family issue. When women bring home less money each day, it means they have less to take care of their family, including for groceries, rent, childcare, and healthcare.

Opponents of this legislation argue—we just heard it—that this is a gift to attorneys representing employees and that their fees should be severely limited. Remember, rights are easily disregarded and violated if you don't have the ability to enforce those rights.

This argument made by opponents is simply an attempt to avoid talking about the pervasiveness of wage discrimination. It is an attempt to decrease enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and to lessen the penalties for employers who engage in discriminatory practices. If nothing else, we should call it out for what it is.

We know that when women succeed, our country thrives. The Paycheck Fairness Act will take us forward to ensuring economic security for working women.

I want to end by acknowledging the extraordinary leadership of ROSA DELAUNO, the Congresswoman from Connecticut who has spent so much of her life dedicated to this issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 7.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In almost every election cycle in which I have participated since 2002, people on the Democratic side of the aisle have talked about wanting to rebuild the middle class. I will submit to you, over the last 26 months, this administration, this President, has rebuilt the middle class.

Let me just quote to you from an article in *The Wall Street Journal* from March 1 of this year, a very recent article. "All sorts of people who have previously had trouble landing a job are now finding work. Racial minorities, those with less education, and people working in the lowest-paying jobs are getting bigger pay raises and, in many cases, experiencing the lowest unemployment rate ever recorded for their groups."

Continuing to quote here: "They are joining manufacturing workers, women in their prime working years, Americans with disabilities, and those with criminal records, among others, in finding improved job prospects after years of disappointment."

It is incongruous to me that we would want to roll-back those gains that this administration has made in the last 26 months.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for the rule and for H. Res. 124. We should approve both and send a powerful message that Congress will not tolerate such a cruel and self-defeating policy.

Last month, the Armed Services Committee's Military Personnel Subcommittee held a hearing that was the first of its kind. The chairwoman, my colleague from California, invited transgender servicemembers to testify. We heard from an impressive panel of five dedicated servicemembers. They asked for nothing more than to be permitted to continue to serve their Nation honorably.

Before the hearing, I met Staff Sergeant Patricia King. Patricia grew up on Cape Cod. She is a combat-tested and decorated infantry soldier who has served nobly for over 20 years in the Army. Her life was turned upside down by a tweet nearly 2 years ago, one that put her military career in jeopardy.

We should never treat our servicemembers so callously. But if Patricia's story isn't sufficiently convincing, consider how shortsighted this ban is as well.

The DOD's total cost for transition-related care in fiscal year 2017 was \$2.2 million, which is one-tenth of 1 percent of DOD's annual healthcare budget for the Active component. Yet the cost to train a single fifth-generation fighter pilot is \$11 million. The retraining cost of losing just one transgender military pilot would be five times more than the entire transition-related care for the military for a year.

Meanwhile, the Army missed its recruitment goal for the first time in more than a decade last year. Now is certainly not the time to turn away well-qualified and patriotic soldiers.

Let's approve the rule and the resolution and say "no" to discrimination.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, this is a great day in America. I am so proud to say that as the Congress considers these bills that protect and advance human rights.

I rise today, specifically, to talk about the Paycheck Fairness Act, because men and women should be able to be paid the same for doing the same work.

I thank my colleagues, ROSA DELAURO and the committee chairman, BOBBY SCOTT, for their advancement of this great legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell you a story, the story of a young lawyer who worked in the public defender's office. Her job was to represent people accused of crimes like murder and robbery. She

was a free lawyer for them. It was very high pressure, and it was very grueling, but she loved it.

When she got the job, she was told a rule: Nobody talks about salary in this office.

But one day, she found out that a male colleague was doing the same job, and he had similar credentials, but he made much more money. She was making \$18,000 a year. He was making \$20,000.

When she asked her boss why, she was told that he, the male attorney, had a wife and children to take care of.

Madam Speaker, that was me. That happened to me 40 years ago.

□ 1245

It was then and still today is a very common experience to millions of women who are still earning 80 cents on the dollar that men make, and actually much less for women of color. It still makes me angry to think about my own experience, but I am not complaining about my own life journey. Fortunately, I have a job now that pays me the same as my male colleagues. I am so happy I am in a position to do something about this today.

As a result of lower lifetime earnings and different work patterns, women are hit hard in retirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FRANKEL. I am too excited, Madam Speaker.

This is why so many women end up in poverty. I want to just say this over and over: women go to work for the same reason men go to work, and that is to take care of their families. Regardless of the circumstance's agenda, we deserve to be paid equally. This Paycheck Fairness Act is going to allow workers to talk openly about their pay. It is going to prohibit asking about salary histories. It is going to require bosses to prove disparities exist for discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill because when women succeed, America succeeds.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind the Speaker and colleagues in the House that when the President came and delivered his State of the Union message, he was significantly proud of the fact that right now more women are working in the workforce than any time in our country's history.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, having more women enter the workforce does not mean that women are earning equal pay for equal work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill, and I particularly thank my colleague, ROSA DELAURO, for decades of work in support of H.R. 7.

In 1963, Congress passed the Equal Pay for Equal Work Act prohibiting an employer from paying men and women different wages for the same work. It helped, but 56 years later, the typical woman working full-time year-round is still paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to her male coworker. That amounts to more than \$10,000 each year.

The gap is even worse for women of color. African American women make only 61 percent of a White man's earnings. Native American women make just 58 percent, and Latina women a mere 53 percent.

But let's be clear. Pay discrimination doesn't just hurt women. It hurts entire families and the overall economy. Women are the sole or primary breadwinners in half of U.S. households with children. So passing this bill would not just help women and families, it would help our entire economy. According to some estimates, equal pay could cut poverty among working women and their families by more than half and add over half a trillion dollars to the U.S. economy.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is simple and straightforward. It protects all employees' right to free speech by ending the unfair prohibitions that can make it a firing offense for someone to simply tell a coworker how much they make. It strengthens workers' ability to challenge gender-based wage discrimination.

It is long overdue, and it is fair. When women succeed, America succeeds, and our overall economy succeeds.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Congresswoman MALONEY, the previous speaker's, comments. She and I served on the Joint Economic Committee together back in 2010. The country just lost a very wise economist, Alan Krueger. I remember Alan Krueger coming in and testifying to our Joint Economic Committee; he testified about—of course, at the time in 2010, the description was that we were in a low-pressure labor market. He contrasted that with the high-pressure labor market of the 1960s. I don't recall if there were specific suggestions how to move from that low-pressure labor market back to a high-pressure labor market, but I don't think there can be any misunderstanding that we are back in a high-pressure labor market. That is a good thing.

I quoted a few minutes ago from an article in *The Wall Street Journal*. Let me just read a little deeper from that article:

One face of the red-hot job market is Cassandra Eaton, 23, a high school graduate who was making \$8.25 an hour at a daycare center near Biloxi, Mississippi, just a few months ago. Now she earns \$19.80—that is almost \$20 an hour—as an apprentice at a shipyard in nearby Pascagoula.

The article continues:

“It’s amazing that I am getting paid almost \$20 an hour to learn how to weld, says Ms. Eaton, the single mother of a young daughter. When she finishes the 2-year apprenticeship, her wage will rise to more than \$27 per hour.”

Madam Speaker, such is the strength of a high-pressure labor market, and I include this article from *The Wall Street Journal* in the RECORD.

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, Mar. 1, 2019]

INSIDE THE HOTTEST JOB MARKET IN HALF A CENTURY

A LOOK AT WHO’S GETTING AHEAD, WHO COULD BE LEFT BEHIND AND HOW LONG THE BOOM CAN LAST

(By Erie Morath and Lauren Weber)

The job market doesn’t get much better than this. The U.S. economy has added jobs for 100 consecutive months. Unemployment recently touched its lowest level in 49 years. Workers are so scarce that, in many parts of the country, low-skill jobs are being handed out to pretty much anyone willing to take them—and high-skilled workers are in even shorter supply.

All sorts of people who have previously had trouble landing a job are now finding work. Racial minorities, those with less education and people working in the lowest-paying jobs are getting bigger pay raises and, in many cases, experiencing the lowest unemployment rate ever recorded for their groups. They are joining manufacturing workers, women in their prime working years, Americans with disabilities and those with criminal records, among others, in finding improved job prospects after years of disappointment.

There are still fault lines. Jobs are still scarce for people living in rural areas of the country. Regions that rely on industries like coal mining or textiles are still struggling. And the tight labor market of the moment may be masking some fundamental shifts in the way we work that will hurt the job prospects of many people later on, especially those who lack advanced degrees and skills.

But for now, at least, many U.S. workers are catching up after years of slow growth and underwhelming wage gains.

One face of the red-hot job market is Cassandra Eaton, 23, a high-school graduate who was making \$8.25 an hour at a daycare center near Biloxi, Miss., just a few months ago. Now she earns \$19.80 an hour as an apprentice at a Huntington Ingalls Industries Inc. shipyard in nearby Pascagoula, where she is learning to weld warships.

The unemployment rate in Mississippi, where Huntington employs 11,500 people, has been below 5 percent since September 2017. Prior to that month, the rate had never been below 5 percent on records dating back to the mid-1970s. In other parts of the country, the rate is even lower. In Iowa and New Hampshire, the December jobless rate was 2.4 percent, tied for the lowest in the country. That’s helped shift power toward job seekers and caused employers to expand their job searches and become more willing to train applicants that don’t meet all qualifications.

“It’s amazing that I’m getting paid almost \$20 an hour to learn how to weld,” says Ms. Eaton, the single mother of a young daughter. When she finishes the two-year apprenticeship, her wage will rise to more than \$27 per hour.

It’s no surprise to economists that many people who were previously left behind are now able to catch up. It’s something policymakers have been working toward for years. Obama administration economists debated how to sustain an unemployment below 5 percent. Now Trump administration officials are considering how to pull those not looking for jobs back into the labor force.

“If you can hold unemployment at a low level for a long time there are substantial benefits,” Janet Yellen, the former chairwoman of the Federal Reserve, said in an interview. “Real wage growth will be faster in a tight labor market. So disadvantaged workers gain on the employment and the wage side, and to my mind, that’s clearly a good thing.”

This was one of Ms. Yellen’s hopes when she was running the Fed from 2014 to 2018; keep interest rates low and let the economy run strong enough to keep driving hiring. In the process, the theory went, disadvantaged workers could be drawn from the fringes of the economy. With luck, inflation wouldn’t take off in the process. Her successor, Jerome Powell, has generally followed the strategy, moving cautiously on rates.

“This is a good time to be patient,” Mr. Powell told members of Congress Tuesday.

The plan seems to be paying big dividends now, but will it yield long-term results for American workers?

Two risks loom. The first is that the low-skill workers who benefit most from a high-pressure job market are often hit hardest when the job market turns south. Consider what happened to high-school dropouts a little more than a decade ago. Their unemployment rate dropped below 6% in 2006 near the end of a historic housing boom, then shot up to more than 15% when the economy crumbled. Many construction, manufacturing and retail jobs disappeared.

The unemployment rate for high-school dropouts fell to 5 percent last year. In the past year, median weekly wages for the group rose more than 6 percent, outpacing all other groups. But if the economy turns toward recession, such improvement could again reverse quickly. “The periods of high unemployment are really terrible,” Ms. Yellen said.

The second risk is that this opportune moment in a long business cycle might be masking long-running trends that still disadvantage many workers. A long line of academic research shows that automation and competition from overseas threaten the work of manufacturing workers and others in mid-skill jobs, such as clerical work, that can be replaced by machines or low-cost workers elsewhere.

The number of receptionists in America, at 1.015 million in 2017, was 86,000 less than a decade earlier, according to the Labor Department. Their annual wage, at \$29,640, was down 5 percent when adjusted for inflation.

Tougher trade deals being pushed by the Trump Administration might help to claw some manufacturing jobs back, but economists note that automation has many of the same effects on jobs in manufacturing and the service section as globalization, replacing tasks that tend to be repeated over and over again.

Andrew McAfee, co-director of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy, said the next recession could be the moment when businesses deploy artificial intelligence, machine learning and other emerging technologies in new ways that further threaten mid-skill work.

“Recessions are a prime opportunity for companies to reexamine what they’re doing, trim headcount and search for ways to automate,” he said. “The pressure to do that is less when a long, long expansion is going on.”

With these forces in play, many economists predict a barbell job market will take hold, playing to the favor of low- and high-skill workers and still disadvantaging many in the middle.

The U.S. is adding jobs in low-skilled services sectors. Four of the six occupations the Labor Department expects to add the most jobs through 2026 require, at most, a high-school diploma. Personal-care aide, a job that pays about \$11 an hour to help the elderly and disabled, is projected to add 778,000 jobs in the decade ended in 2026, the most of 819 occupations tracked. The department expects the economy to add more than half a million food-prep workers and more than a quarter million janitors.

Those low-skill workers are reaping pay gains in part because there aren’t a lot of people eager to fill low-skill jobs anymore. Only about 6 percent of U.S. workers don’t hold a high school diploma, down from above 40 percent in the 1960s, according research by MIT economist David Autor.

James O. Wilson dropped out of high school in the 10th grade and started selling drugs, which eventually led to a lengthy incarceration. When Mr. Wilson, 59, was released in 2013 he sought out training at Goodwill, where he learned to drive a forklift. Those skills led him to a part-time job at a FedEx Corp. facility at an Indianapolis airport. He was promoted to a full-time job in 2017 and is now earning more than \$16 an hour. He has a house with his wife and enjoys taking care of his cars, including a prized Cadillac.

“I wanted to show FedEx you can take a person, and he can change,” he said. “I want FedEx to say, ‘Do you have any more people like him?’”

Skilled workers in high-tech and managerial positions are also benefiting from the high-pressure labor market, particularly in thriving cities. Of 166 sectors that employ at least 100,000 Americans, software publishing pays the highest average wages, \$59.81 an hour in the fourth quarter of 2018. Wages in the field grew 5.5 percent from a year earlier, well outpacing 3.3 percent overall growth in hourly pay. The average full-time employee in the sector already earns more than \$100,000 a year.

Other technical industries, scientific research and computer systems design, were also among the five best paying fields. Some of the hottest labor markets in the U.S.—including Austin, Texas; San Jose, Calif.; and Seattle—have more than twice the concentration of technical jobs as the country on average.

A Wall Street Journal analysis of Moody’s Analytics data found Austin to be the hottest labor market in the country among large metros. It ranked second in job growth, third for share of adults working and had the sixth-lowest unemployment rate last year, among 53 regions with a population of more than a million. San Jose, the second-hottest labor market, had the lowest average unemployment rate last year and the second-best wage growth.

While a strong economy is conveying benefits to a broad swath of Americans, those in rural areas aren’t experiencing the same lift from the rising tide.

In metro areas with fewer than 100,000 people and in rural America, the average unemployment last year was half a percentage point higher compared to metro areas with more than a million people, according to an analysis by job search site Indeed.com.

"Finding work can be challenging for rural job-seekers because rural workers and employers both have fewer options," said Indeed economist Jed Kolko. "Many rural areas have slow-growing or shrinking populations."

Bradley Cox lives in Vevay, Ind., a rural community of fewer than 2,000 people. The 23-year-old graduated with a bachelor's degree in business administration and liberal arts from Indiana University East in December, but said he had found opportunities limited in his region.

After years working in hourly positions at a casino, he took a job last summer as a cashier at a CVS Health Corp. drug store, making about \$12 an hour. He hoped to work at a bank, or perhaps in a traveling sales role, making use of his business degree. "But to be honest, for me to do that, I would have to move to one of the cities or commute to one of the cities, at least," he says. "I don't have the opportunity around where I live."

Other workers are employed—but need to string together two or more jobs to make ends meet.

Michelle Blandy, 48, had a full-time digital marketing job in Phoenix but hasn't been able to find steady work since moving to Harrisburg, Pa., to be closer to her family. Instead she's pieced together some freelance projects, occasionally drives for Lyft and sells refurbished jewelry boxes on Etsy. "I have applied for full-time jobs, I just didn't have any luck," she said. "Harrisburg is tiny compared to Phoenix. There's not as many tech companies or big companies here that are hiring."

The good news is this long run of low unemployment could last for a while. Economic theory holds that when unemployment is very low, it stirs inflation, which causes the Federal Reserve to raise short-term interest rates and short-circuit growth and hiring. That kind of cycle ended the 1960s period of low unemployment, but inflation in this period remains below the Fed's target of 2 percent.

That has allowed the Fed to keep rates low. By January 1970, when the unemployment rate was 3.9 percent, the Fed had raised its target short-term interest rate to more than 8 percent to fight inflation. By contrast, when the jobless rate fell below 4 percent last year, the Fed kept its target rate below 2.5 percent thanks to low inflation.

"It may turn out that lower unemployment proves to be more sustainable than it was in the 1960s," says Ms. Yellen. "I think we don't know yet."

Mr. BURGESS. Again, I would point out that since the inauguration of Donald Trump, our labor market has, in fact, experienced a resurgence that a rising tide is indeed lifting all boats. It is incumbent upon us not to damage the economy that has brought the benefit to so many people—so many of those forgotten Americans—who were denied that benefit before, those very Americans to whom President Trump committed at the time of his inauguration in January 2017.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Madam Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the resolution.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) to explain the amendment.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas, Representative BURGESS, for yielding me time on this most important issue.

First, I would like to talk about the underlying bill. Equal work does deserve equal pay, regardless of the sex of the employee. In America, this is already the law of the land, and it has been since 1963 when Congress passed the Equal Pay Act. However, we stand here today debating a rule for a partisan Democrat bill that offers no protections against pay discrimination in the workplace. Instead, the bill makes it easier for trial lawyers to score unlimited paydays while dragging working women through never-ending legal dramas.

This bill also prevents women from utilizing their expertise, skills, talents, and education to their advantage. It effectively ties employers' hands from considering factors that would allow them to potentially give employees better working environments or for employees to negotiate a higher salary.

According to Camille Olson, who testified as a witness in the House Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services and on the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, there can indeed be unintended negative consequences from this bill.

Let me read an example from her written testimony. This is her statement, and she gave an example.

It basically says: In this example an employer has chosen to pay a higher salary to a female law firm office administrator who has a J.D. degree. The job duties for that position do not include legal work. Nevertheless, in the employer's judgment, the performance of those job duties will be enhanced by the additional qualifications of a J.D., justifying the higher salary.

In this example, the male employee had a lesser degree. So in this example—because in this bill it requires business necessity—the male could sue. Even though he doesn't have as high a degree as the woman, he could say: I want equal pay.

So, what I am trying to say is because of the wording of this bill, I believe—and the witness in the committees believes—there are unintended consequences that could actually hurt women.

The employee may have a claim even if the advanced degree does actually improve performance or serve another legitimate business goal where it was

not absolutely required for the job, because of the business necessity requirement in the bill.

This example may not be the exception. As our economy and culture shifts, we are finding ourselves in a world where women are attending and graduating college far more often than men. According to the U.S. Department of Education data, nearly 60 percent of those who graduated with a bachelor's degree were women. So, certainly, we do not want the unintended consequences of an employer not being able to consider the advanced education of a woman under this business necessity language in the bill.

H.R. 7 is more of the same from the new majority: government knows best. It will tie the hands of employers and prevent employees—especially female employees—from negotiating a salary and working environment that works for them and their family. It is already against the law to discriminate, and commonsense approaches to amending the law were summarily rejected by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we would amend this rule to include a simple change. It provides working parents more flexibility so that they can go to baseball games and science fairs; in other words, to be better parents.

I would like to read a portion of that amendment:

Notwithstanding the other provisions of the subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer consistent with other provisions of this act.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. We all know that the greatest benefit working parents with young children want and value is flexibility. Our concern is that this radical proposal which is called paycheck fairness would actually limit the flexibility employers can give to working parents, so parents can go to their activities.

This amendment is a very simple amendment. It simply restates the law and makes it clear that if you run a dry cleaner with five people in it, you don't have to hire a lawyer to define a job for an employee with a child in such a way that the employee can go to the science fair or a baseball game.

Instead of being about more litigation and trial lawyers, it is about giving more flexibility for working parents. Working Americans should have the freedom to choose what is best for them and their families, not the Federal Government. Hardworking men and women need more flexibility to balance work, life, and family. This amendment seeks to provide additional relief in this area.

Madam Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question and "no" on the underlying measure.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, while this resolution attempts to increase protections against wage discrimination based on sex, it does not significantly improve what already exists in current law.

I agree with my Democratic friends that there should be no tolerance for wage discrimination based on sex or for any other factor protected under the Equal Pay or Civil Rights Act, but this bill is not the way to do so.

So, Madam Speaker, as we conclude, I urge a “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The smart and innovative women of Arizona’s Eighth Congressional District deserve to have a voice in this debate, and I am going to give it to them.

They earn 80 cents to every dollar that their male counterpart earns. They deserve to have fair wages for the equal work that they are performing.

Before I begin my closing statement, I would like to take a moment to honor a valuable member of my staff: Justin Vogt.

Justin has been my legislative director for 2 years. During that time, he has been a phenomenal member of my team, designing innovative legislative initiatives, providing wise counsel, and serving as a generous mentor to my junior staff.

Now he will move on to be an excellent staff director for the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee. We are sad to see our waffle maker, Justin, leave our office, but we are so proud of all that he has accomplished.

Madam Speaker, 60 years from now, I hope that we have moved forward as a Nation. I hope that our daughters and granddaughters grow up in an America that recognizes their value through the quality of their work and not their gender. Imagine that.

The Paycheck Fairness Act gets us closer to securing a future for them.

A recent McKinsey study found that, if women’s full potential in the labor market was reached, \$4.3 trillion would be added to the labor market in 2025. Our economy would benefit from that woman power.

There has been enough talk about lawyer fees. Women attorneys deserve equal pay for equal work, too. This argument is nothing more than an attempt to avoid talking about the pervasiveness of wage discrimination in this country.

The policies in the Paycheck Fairness Act work. Just look at California. In 2017, Californian women made a median of 89 cents to every dollar made by their male counterparts.

In just a few years, we decreased gender pay disparity by more than any other State.

I have heard it said that addressing wage equity is bad for moms. What is

bad about getting fair pay? Equal pay for equal work.

Mothers make 71 cents for every dollar earned by fathers in similar jobs. If we paid women fairly, maybe they would get a chance to spend more time with their kids.

If my colleagues care about moms spending time with their kids, let’s pass National Paid Family Leave Act standards. Let’s create better working conditions for pregnant women. Let’s fund programs for affordable childcare.

This is just the beginning. The cost for American women, their families, and our economy is much too high to wait any longer.

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

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Lesko of Arizona or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows: after section 3 insert the following:

SEC. 3A. FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKING PARENTS.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer, consistent with other provisions of this Act.”

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—231

Adams	Beatty	Bonamici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Allred	Beyer	F.
Axne	Bishop (GA)	Brindisi
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brownley (CA)

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

NAYS—192

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

Guest	Massie	Scott, Austin	Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)	Mast	Roby	Taylor
Guthrie	Mast	Sensenbrenner	Demings	Larson (CT)	Richmond	McCarthy	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (PA)
Hagedorn	McCarthy	Shimkus	DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rose (NY)	McCaul	Roe, David P.	Thornberry
Harris	McCaul	Simpson	Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rouda	McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Timmons
Hartzler	McClintock	Smith (MO)	Dingell	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Hern, Kevin	McHenry	Smith (NE)	Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruiz	McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Turner
Herrera Beutler	McKinley	Smith (NJ)	Doyle, Michael F.	Levin (CA)	Ruppersberger	Meadows	Rose, John W.	Upton
Hice (GA)	Meadows	Smucker	Engel	Levin (MI)	Rush	Meuser	Rouzer	Wagner
Higgins (LA)	Meuser	Spano	Escobar	Lewis	Ryan	Miller	Roy	Walberg
Hill (AR)	Miller	Staubert	Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez	Mitchell	Rutherford	Walden
Holding	Mitchell	Stefanik	Espallat	Lipinski	Sarbanes	Moolenaar	Scalise	Walker
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Steil	Evans	Loeb sack	Scanlon	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert	Walorski
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Steube	Finkenaue	Lofgren	Schiff	Mullin	Scott, Austin	Waltz
Huizenga	Mullin	Stewart	Fletcher	Lowenthal	Schneider	Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Hunter	Newhouse	Stivers	Foster	Lowey	Schrader	Norman	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Norman	Taylor	Frankel	Lujan	Schrier	Nunes	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)	Fudge	Luria	Scott (VA)	Olson	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thornberry	Gabbard	Lynch	Scott, David	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Timmons	Gallego	Malinowski	Serrano	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Jordan	Palmer	Tipton	Garamendi	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Sewell (AL)	Pence	Smucker	Williams
Joyce (OH)	Pence	Turner	Garcia (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Shalala	Perry	Spano	Womack
Joyce (PA)	Perry	Upton	Garcia (TX)	Matsui	Sherman	Posey	Staubert	Woodall
Katko	Posey	Wagner	Golden	McAdams	Sherrill	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Wright
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Walberg	Gomez	McBath	Sires	Reed	Steil	Yoho
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Walden	Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Slotkin	Reschenthaler	Steube	Young
King (IA)	Reschenthaler	Walker	Gottheimer	McEachin	Smith (WA)	Rice (SC)	Stewart	Zeldin
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Walorski	Green (TX)	McGovern	Soto	Rigglesman	Stivers	
Kinzing	Rigglesman	Waltz	Grijalva	McNerney	Spanberger			
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Watkins	Haa land	Meeks	Speier			
LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Weber (TX)	Harder (CA)	Meng	Stanton			
LaMalfa	Roe, David P.	Webster (FL)	Hastings	Moore	Stevens			
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup	Hayes	Morelle	Suo zzi			
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Westerman	Heck	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)			
Lesko	Rooney (FL)	Williams	Higgins (NY)	Mucarsel-Powell	Takano			
Long	Rose, John W.	Womack	Hill (CA)	Murphy	Thompson (CA)			
Loudermilk	Rouzer	Woodall	Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler	Thompson (MS)			
Lucas	Roy	Wright	Horsford	Napolitano	Titus			
Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Yoho	Houllahan	Neal	Tlaib			
Marchant	Scalise	Young	Hoyer	Neguse	Tonko			
Marshall	Schweikert	Zeldin	Huffman	Norcross	Torres (CA)			
			Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Trahan			
			Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Trone			
			Jeffries	Omar	Underwood			
			Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Van Drew			
			Johnson (TX)	Panetta	Vargas			
			Kaptur	Pappas	Veasey			
			Keating	Pascrell	Vela			
			Kelly (IL)	Payne	Velázquez			
			Kennedy	Perlmutter	Visclosky			
			Khanna	Peters	Wasserman			
			Kildee	Peterson	Schultz			
			Kilmer	Phillips	Waters			
			Kim	Pingree	Watson Coleman			
			Kind	Pocan	Welch			
			Kirkpatrick	Porter	Wexton			
			Krishnamoorthi	Pressley	Wild			
			Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)			
			Lamb	Quigley	Yarmuth			
			Langevin	Raskin				

NOT VOTING—8

Amodei	Serrano	Wittman
DesJarlais	Torres Small	
Granger	(NM)	
Meng	Wilson (SC)	

□ 1331

Messrs. SMITH of Nebraska, STIVERS, MCCAUL, JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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 232, nays 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Kinzing	Wittman
Himes	Torres Small	
Hollingsworth	(NM)	

□ 1340

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.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, on March 27, 2019, I was unable to be present for the vote on the motion to agree to H. Res. 252, offered by Rep. TORRES of California. Had I been present for rollcall No. 131, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 131.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, earlier today I was not present to cast a vote on the Combined Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 131.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call Vote No. 130 on ordering the previous question of H. Res. 252 and Roll Call No. 131 on adoption of the rule, H. Res. 252. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 130 and No 131.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a bill which has the full support of the Republican Conference and the majority of the American people, as it would save the lives of liveborn infants that have survived late-term abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been

cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that the Republican Conference is in full agreement. Is the Democratic conference not onboard with saving lives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated, a unanimous consent request for the consideration of that measure would have to have received clearance ahead of time by the majority and minority floor and committee leaderships.

The Chair is unaware of such clearance; therefore, the Chair cannot entertain the request at this time.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I would ask that we schedule a vote immediately. The Republican Conference is fully onboard, and I would encourage the Democrats to join us in protecting the infant lives that are born.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is not recognized.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 252 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1345

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, with Ms. NORTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her decades of leadership fighting for working women.

In 1963, the Equal Pay Act codified the right to "equal pay for equal work regardless of sex." In fact, the Equal Pay Act was enacted 1 year prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that, for the first time, provided for the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws. Over the past 55 years, the Equal Pay Act, in combination with title VII of the Civil Rights Act, has produced substantial progress toward addressing inequities for women in the workplace.

Yet, loopholes and insufficient enforcement have allowed gender-based wage discrimination to persist. Today, women earn, on average, 80 cents on the dollar compared to White men in similar jobs. The wage gap is even worse for women of color. It exists in every sector, regardless of education, experience, occupation, industry, or job title.

Drawn out over a lifetime, the persistent wage gap could cost a woman anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million. For many, this is the difference between financial stability and poverty. In fact, we know that achieving pay equity would actually cut the poverty rate for working women more than 50 percent.

That is why we are considering this historic legislation today. After decades of failing to address persistent wage inequity, the Paycheck Fairness Act is our opportunity to strengthen the Equal Pay Act, bolster the rights of working women, lift families out of poverty, and, finally, align our remedies for gender discrimination with other established antidiscrimination laws by eliminating caps on damages when employers act with malice or reckless indifference, consistent with the laws governing discrimination based on race or national origin, treating attorney fees consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and restricting an employer's inquiry and reliance on a prospective employee's previous salary. This is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act, and similar restrictions regarding an applicant's marital or pregnancy status.

As chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I urge my colleagues to join me in casting a vote for final passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act and making equal pay for equal work a reality for working women across this country.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my friend, the chairman, is a diligent and thoughtful colleague, and I believe his heart is in the right place.

Everyone in this House is in agreement that pay discrimination on the basis of sex is wrong, no matter how you look at it. The law is very clear about this. But this bill doesn't do anything to help working women. This is a bill for trial lawyers, plain and simple. That is what shows a fundamental difference in outlook and principle. Democrats want women to sue their bosses; Republicans want women to become the bosses.

Republicans have favored strong economic policies that will empower and enable women to keep driving the economy forward and build the lives they want for themselves. Instead of looking for ways to line the pockets of trial lawyers, we stand with working women.

I am proud, Madam Chair, to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), one of the hardest working women I know.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Chair, I would like to start by thanking my dear friend and colleague, Ms. FOXX, the Republican leader of the House Education and Labor Committee, for her tremendous work and leadership on behalf of all American women and families.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act. This should be called the "Pay the Trial Lawyers Act."

Madam Chair, my State of Wyoming launched the fight for women's equality and rights when we became the first jurisdiction in the world to grant women the right to vote 150 years ago. Here in this Chamber, 100 years ago, the House agreed that women should have the right to vote on a national basis. Leaders of the women's suffrage movement were fighting on behalf of women's rights. They were not fighting to provide greater payouts to trial lawyers. We should honor those women, and the generations of women who came after them, by defeating this sham bill.

The bill my Democratic colleagues have put on the floor today offers no new protections for women in the workplace. It paints job creators, many of whom in the Trump economy are increasingly women, as evil. Republicans know that economic policies that generate growth, create jobs, and increase wages benefit women and men. Our policies empower women and facilitate the success of women-owned businesses, which account for roughly 9 million jobs and \$1.7 trillion in revenue.

Madam Chair, today's bill is just the latest example of the misguided and damaging policies Democrats in this

body are attempting to pursue. They claim to be “for the people,” but in the nearly 3 months that they have been in charge, they have embraced socialism; they have enabled anti-Semitism; they have passed legislation that violates the First Amendment and the Second Amendment; and they have repeatedly refused to take steps necessary to protect the lives of babies after those babies are born.

Now, Madam Chair, they are telling us they are fighting for women when really they are simply fighting for trial lawyers. We have seen this movie before. The Democrats are not really for the people. They are for the government and for the special interest groups that support them. The American people know better, and we deserve better.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this bill, and I call on my Democratic colleagues to come together with us, to work with us, so that we can actually make real progress for America’s women and their families.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

It is a historic day on the House of Representatives floor, and we are going to pass paycheck fairness, equal pay for equal work, in this United States of America.

Madam Chair, I thank the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee for getting this bill through the committee and onto the floor today. We have waited 8 years to be able to vote on this issue.

The United States Congress has a rich history of making a difference in the lives of the American people: Social Security, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the GI Bill, Medicare, and the Affordable Care Act, to name but a few.

Today, we can make a difference for working women and their families. Today, we can address the biggest economic challenge of our time, that Americans are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. We can address their economic struggle. And, yes, this is a bill that the majority is passing today to address that economic need for families.

I cannot tell you how difficult it has been to break through on something so simple: Men and women in the same job deserve the same pay. But now, the issue and the environment have collided. Equal pay is at the center of our public discourse, and paycheck fairness is ready for passage today.

A bipartisan bill supported by every member of the Democratic Caucus, the Paycheck Fairness Act toughens remedies in the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to give America’s working women the opportunity to fight wage discrimination and to receive the paycheck that they have earned.

Under existing law, damages are too insubstantial to provide women with

full restitution or provide bad-acting companies a meaningful deterrent.

Paycheck fairness puts gender-based discrimination sanctions on equal footing with other forms of wage discrimination by allowing women to sue for compensatory and punitive damages. It better protects employees from being fired for sharing their salary with co-workers. It establishes a grant program to provide salary negotiation training for girls and for women. It ensures that employers are not reliant on wage history when they hire an employee.

Over 60 years ago, after Republican President Dwight Eisenhower called for equal pay legislation during his 1956 State of the Union Address on the floor of this House, and more than 55 years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, pay discrimination is very much still a reality in our country. In 2017, there were almost 26,000 charges of unlawful, sex-based pay discrimination filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and 996 Equal Pay Act charges.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Women continue to earn 20 percent less than men, on average, according to Census data. Women earn less regardless of the choices they make in their career or education. Across industries, whether you are a financial manager, a registered nurse, a schoolteacher, or an executive, a pay gap exists between men and women.

Ten years ago, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. It reopened the courtroom door but did not address the underlying issue at hand today.

We have an opportunity to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. It is a matter of right and wrong. Discrimination is unacceptable, and we are all diminished when we fall short.

President Kennedy said, when he signed the Equal Pay Act, that this would “add to our laws another structure basic to democracy” and “affirm our determination that when women enter the labor force, they will find equality in their pay envelope.”

We can do this today on the floor of this House. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act and make sure that we guarantee equal pay for equal work.

□ 1400

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my distinguished colleague.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Chair, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 7. It is a deeply flawed bill that offers false promises while empowering lawyers and bureaucracy, not empowering women.

In fact, I agree with my colleague from Wyoming who said a minute ago it should not be called the Paycheck

Fairness Act; it should be called the pay the trial lawyers act.

If there exists residual bias and discrimination against women in the workplace, it is wrong, and it needs to end. Since 1963, equal pay for equal work has been the law of the land under the Equal Pay Act.

Let me say that again. Since 1963, equal pay for equal work has been the law of the land. It is currently illegal for employers to pay different wages based on gender, and as the bill sponsor just said, there are currently mechanisms to address any wrongs that may be there.

While I appreciate the sentiment of the bill before us, I cannot support its flawed approach. The pay the trial lawyers act does not build on the Equal Pay Act. It does not offer women new protections against discrimination in the workplace. Instead, it encourages lawsuits against employers by offering the prospect of unlimited monetary damages.

The pay the trial lawyers act also creates an impossibly high burden of proof for job creators defending themselves in lawsuits.

Furthermore, the pay the trial lawyers act handicaps job creators, including women-owned businesses, by adding onerous compensation reporting requirements. The Federal bureaucracy will heap yet another burden on hard-working Americans if this passes.

So, Madam Chair, the pay the trial lawyers act does not build on the Equal Pay Act’s success. Instead, it encourages lawsuits, hurts job creators, and empowers lawyers. Sadly, it also misses an opportunity to truly help women.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this deeply flawed bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him also for his extraordinary leadership in matters that relate to the education of the American people, employment preparedness, fairness in our workforce, and, of course, today.

Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for giving us this opportunity on this day of the House of Representatives. This is a day that God has made. Let us rejoice and be glad. And let us make the most of it in a very joyous way. It is a day of celebration.

Madam Chair, the gentleman, BOBBY SCOTT, has been a supporter of this initiative for a long time, and I thank him for making today possible.

And it happens on a day when we are honored to have, in the Speaker’s chair, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a champion to end discrimination in every way in our country, including discrimination in the paycheck.

Madam Chair, today I rise in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act. It reaffirms our Nation's sacred promise that equal pay deserves equal work.

I do so in saluting Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, Madam Chair, the guardian angel of this legislation and the godmother of so many initiatives in this House to support progress for America's working families.

The ability to balance work, to balance work and home is a challenge that many families face, men and women alike, but ROSA DELAURO has been a constant champion for America's working families.

While we are talking today about equality in the paycheck, she has also been a champion for paid sick leave and affordable childcare. The list goes on and on. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman—guardian angel, godmother—for making today possible.

I am very excited about this. It is historic. It should happen at a time when we have over 100 women serving in the House of Representatives, and it should happen in the same Congress that we will also observe the 100th anniversary of the passing of the amendment to have women have the right to vote.

It is all very historic. It is all about progress, and that progress on this bill began in this Congress 2 months ago. House Democrats stood with Lilly Ledbetter on the 10th anniversary of President Obama signing the Lilly Ledbetter Act, exactly 10 years ago, signing that Fair Pay bill into law.

It was a magnificent achievement, it, too, being led by George Miller, the chair of the committee Mr. SCOTT now chairs. ROSA DELAURO, of course, played a hand in that.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) then introduced the equal pay bill, and then we passed it in the House. It didn't pass the Senate—60 votes needed in the Senate—but she has persisted, and we are fortunate for that.

We are grateful to her and to Lilly Ledbetter and the groups, so many outside groups that have worked so hard to mobilize and make this difference—some of them include the American Association of University Women, the National Women's Law Center, National Partnership for Women and Families, National Organization for Women, National Committee for Pay Equity, MomsRising, UltraViolet, Center for Law and Social Policy, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP, League of Women Voters, U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, the list goes on and on, the Anti-Defamation League, the American Psychological Association, and many more—because that outside mobilization will be important in passing this legislation and turning it into law, into an improvement in the lives of America's working families.

Now we are proud to pass this bill before Equal Pay Day, which is on April 2, next week—April Pay Day, which

symbolizes when a woman's wages catch up to a man's earnings from the previous year. In other words, the first 3 months of the year, most women are working for free compared to what a man will make in the overall year.

So April 2 is that day. By then, we will have already been celebrating for a few days.

We pass this legislation during Women's History Month as we serve with a woman Speaker of the House and with more than 100 women in the same Congress, as I said before, marking 100 years since women won the right to vote.

So this is about respect. It is about respect, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, respect for women and the work that they do. And if they do equal work, why wouldn't they get equal pay?

Would you, my colleague, like to get less than your colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle?

Would you, any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, like to work for less than our male counterparts?

Well, why should women and the rest of the workforce then be subjected to that discrimination?

Paycheck fairness is about respect. It is about justice for women, finally closing the wage gap that robs women of more than \$400,000 over the course of their working lives. And for women of color, it is even a bigger difference.

And this not only has an impact on their pay, it has an impact on their pensions and on their retirement. So this is very, very important.

This legislation advances progress for families because it is about equal pay for women. It is about how that equality of paycheck affects their families, ensuring that women can earn the wages they have earned so they can pay for their family's everyday needs, such as rent, groceries, childcare, healthcare—the list goes on.

Two-thirds of moms are either the primary breadwinners or co-breadwinners in their households in our country. This legislation strengthens America, unleashing the full power of women in our economy and upholding the value of fairness.

Do you believe in fairness in our democracy?

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law in 1963, he celebrated equal pay as a "structure basic to democracy"—equal pay, a structure basic to democracy—enlarging the issue to our great democracy.

We are proud to take this step to fully and finally secure the paycheck fairness that is fundamental to our democracy because it will implement the Equal Pay Act, make it enforceable.

Yet, securing paycheck fairness is only the first step that House Democrats will take. We will continue to unlock the full economic power of women in our workplace with paid sick leave, led by Congresswoman DELAURO, affordable childcare, led by Congresswoman DELAURO, as well as a fair wage

because we know that, in our economy and in our country, when women succeed, America succeeds.

I, therefore, urge a bipartisan vote for this legislation for women to succeed and to have equality in our society as they have equality in their paychecks.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I believe all my colleagues can agree that women deserve equal pay for equal work. However, the bill considered today takes the wrong approach to ensure that current equal protections, protections that have been in place since 1963, are reaffirmed and fortified.

This bill offers no new protections for women in the workforce. Instead, it makes it more difficult for employers and employees to have an open and informative discussion about hiring and other employment decisions.

Perhaps worst of all, it is designed in a way that helps increase the bottom line for lawyers. That is right. The only paychecks that this legislation will increase are paychecks for lawyers.

It is unfair to women; it is unfair to the workforce; and it is unfair to businesses.

It may come as a surprise to many people that the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act offers no new protections against pay discrimination.

Let me repeat that. The legislation being debated today offers no new protections against pay discrimination. Instead, it imposes a one-size-fits-all mandate to one of the most varied and complex workforces in the world.

Rather than allowing for informal discussions, the Paycheck Fairness Act strictly limits communications between employers and employees on key hiring decisions. Under this bill, the burden is laid on the backs of employers, and the lack of clarity for employees is simply unworkable.

I don't see how limiting the discussion between employers and employees, particularly on hiring decisions, is going to help anybody; and I certainly don't see how opening the gates to limitless, frivolous lawsuits is going to help anybody.

It should be noted, the Lilly Ledbetter Pay Act that the Speaker just alluded to was signed 10 years ago with the promise that it would alleviate pay discrimination in the workplace. Yet, if you look at pay discrimination charges filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, they have remained steady each year since 1997, both before and after the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act became law. I am hearing that same kind of overpromising when it comes to H.R. 7.

In an effort to improve the bill and ensure the damages actually go to the women impacted instead of lawyers, I offered an amendment that would cap

attorney's fees for any judgment to 20 percent of the judgment. Sadly, this commonsense amendment was blocked by the Rules Committee.

Why don't my colleagues want to join me in ensuring that money actually gets to victims of pay discrimination instead of simply padding the wallets of lawyers?

It is a real shame this amendment was not made in order. I think we can all agree that the idea of discrimination against someone based on sex is absolutely unacceptable, and it is inconsistent with the values we hold as Americans.

This issue is not partisan. In 1944, Republican Congresswoman Winifred Stanley introduced a precursor to the Equal Pay Act, which, since passing years later, has been the law of the land for the past 55 years.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 specifically made it illegal to pay different wages to employees of the opposite sex for equal work. In addition, title 7 of the Civil Rights Act made it illegal for employers to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, and sex.

Yet, as I said before, despite these protections on the books, there are bad actors who continue to practice pay discrimination. Based on laws existing for decades, it is unacceptable, and we must hold these bad actors accountable.

Unfortunately, the Paycheck Fairness Act, as written, fails to improve employment protections.

□ 1415

We have a responsibility to the American people to craft strong policies that support women in the workplace, not merely offer weak lip service that, in fact, cripples employers and employees alike.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this phony bill, and, instead, let's work together in a bipartisan way to actually ensure women continue to thrive in the workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, today women make up nearly half of our workforce. Sixty-four percent of mothers in the United States work outside the home. Many are the sole family wage earner. Their wages pay for rent, for groceries, for childcare, for healthcare. But even though it is 2019, too often, equal pay for equal work is not a reality.

On average, White women earn 80 cents on the dollar compared with White men in substantially equal jobs. The wage gap is even more pronounced for women of color in nearly every line of work, regardless of education, experience, occupation, industry, or job title.

This has severe and long-term consequences for the lives of working women, families, and for our economy. With the Equal Pay Act, title VII of

the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and more recently, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, we have made some progress in reducing inequities for women in the workplace. But, unfortunately, loopholes and insufficient enforcement tools have allowed wage discrimination to persist.

For example, a lack of easily accessible data on hiring and wages has made it difficult to detect, let alone prevent, wage discrimination. And even when wage discrimination is discovered, working women face significant barriers to fulfilling the heavy burden of proof for holding discriminating employers accountable.

Last month, I was honored to chair the hearing on persistent, gender-based wage discrimination. We heard witnesses describe the barriers to detecting wage discrimination and holding employers accountable. But most importantly, we heard how the Paycheck Fairness Act will provide workers with the tools they need to help close the gender pay gap and achieve wage equality.

Several States have already acted to address pay inequities, including bipartisan efforts in my home State of Oregon. It is time for Congress to step up and address persistent wage discrimination nationwide.

By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, we have the opportunity to end discriminatory pay practices that contribute to keeping women and families in poverty. We have the opportunity to finally make equal pay for equal work a reality.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from AARP outlining support for the Paycheck Fairness Act because the bill will strengthen financial security for women while in the workforce, and later enhance retirement income security.

AARP,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of our 38 million members and all Americans age 50 and older, AARP is writing to express our support for the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7). This bill would strengthen financial security for women both while in the workforce and later in retirement, and it would provide an important protection for all workers against age discrimination in hiring.

Pay discrimination against women jeopardizes their financial security, both while working and in retirement. The roughly 20 percent pay gap between women and men who work full-time, year-round means women's median earnings are more than \$10,000 a year less than men's, with an even bigger shortfall for women of color. Because all elements of retirement income—Social Security, pensions, and savings—are based on one's earnings while in the workforce, lower earnings during women's work lives follow them into retirement. As a result, women age 65 and older are 80 percent more likely than men to live below the poverty level in

retirement. By strengthening the law against pay discrimination, H.R. 7 would help address women's lower pay and lower incomes in retirement.

In addition, AARP supports the Paycheck Fairness Act's provision on salary history. While asking about a job applicant's prior salary history has long been recognized as a barrier to equal pay it has also proven to be a barrier to employment for older workers. A majority (56 percent) of all older workers age 50 plus have been prematurely pushed out of longtime jobs before they choose to retire. Once displaced, older workers have great difficulty finding reemployment, and most are unable to find a job with wages comparable to the job they lost. It is quite common for prospective employers to use a prior higher salary level to disqualify an older applicant from consideration because they simply assume that the worker will require the same wage. However, there are many reasons why an older worker might be willing to accept a lower salary, including better benefits or work hours; a more desirable job/firm; a career change; or simply desperation to find a new job. In these cases, the ability of the employer to ask about and rely on salary history in considering an older applicant often results in age discrimination in hiring.

In conclusion, H.R. 7 will help prevent one of the age-related assumptions that hinder equal opportunity for older workers, as well as enhance retirement income security for women. For these reasons, we urge support for the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,

Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy
& Engagement Officer.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the AAUW in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

AAUW,

March 25, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 170,000 members and supporters of the American Association of University Women (AAUW), I urge you to vote in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and to oppose harmful amendments when the bill comes to the House floor as soon as this week. Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist. The Paycheck Fairness Act offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle these pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

In January, we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. This vital law rectified the Supreme Court's harmful decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company*. The law helps to ensure that individuals subjected to unlawful compensation discrimination are able to bring a case of ongoing pay discrimination regardless of when it began. Despite the importance of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, this law's enactment only restored decades of prior law—it did not give women new tools to receive equal pay for equal work.

There is no more fitting way to mark this historic milestone than making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive fair pay. While the gap has narrowed since passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, progress has largely stalled in recent years. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau once again revealed that women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men. The pay gaps have grown even wider for women of color. African American women and Latinas make, respectively, 61 and 53 cents on the dollar as compared to non-Hispanic, white men. The overall pay gap has only decreased

by a nickel during the 21st century and, unless action is taken, the pay gap between men's and women's earnings will not close until 2106.

Research indicates that the gender pay gap develops very early in women's careers. Controlling for factors known to affect earnings, such as education and training, marital status, and hours worked, research finds that college-educated women still earn 7 percent less than men just one year out of college. Over time, the gap compounds and widens, impacting women's social security and retirement.

Ensuring that women have equal pay would have a dramatic impact on families and the economy. Many companies have already recognized the benefits and the power of women's increased economic participation, and that is why business groups like the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce and Main Street Alliance have endorsed the Paycheck Fairness Act. According to a 2017 report from Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR), the poverty rate for all working women would be cut in half, falling from 8.0 percent to 3.8 percent, if women were paid the same as comparable men. The same study by IWPR indicates that the U.S. economy would have produced an additional \$512.6 billion in income if women had received equal pay for equal work. This is why I urge you to pass this important bill.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides effective protection against sex-based pay discrimination in today's workplace.

The bill takes several important steps, including:

Ensuring Non-Retaliation: The bill prohibits retaliation against workers for discussing or disclosing wages. Without the non-retaliation provisions of the Paycheck Fairness Act, many women will continue to be silenced in the workplace—that is, prohibited from talking about wages with coworkers due to the fear of being fired. This is an issue that keeps women—like it kept Lilly Ledbetter—from learning of pay discrimination against them.

Prohibiting Use of Salary History: The bill prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that prior pay discrimination doesn't follow workers from job to job.

Ensuring Job-Relatedness: The bill closes loopholes that have weakened the Equal Pay Act over time by ensuring that disparities in pay are justified by a business necessity that is related to the job.

Equalizing Remedies: The bill ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity.

Providing Additional Assistance and Resources: The bill also provides technical assistance to businesses, requires wage data collection, and supports salary negotiation skills training programs to give workers the tools to advocate for higher wages.

Providing a Small Business Exception: The Equal Pay Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act have an exemption for small businesses that generate less than \$500,000 in annual revenues a year, and the Paycheck Fairness Act would keep that exemption intact. The bill would also support small businesses with technical assistance.

The pay gap is persistent and can only be addressed if women are armed with the tools necessary to challenge discrimination against them, and employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law. I urge you to take a critical step towards achieving pay equity by voting in support of the Paycheck

Fairness Act and opposing harmful amendments when the bill comes to the House floor for a vote as soon as this week.

We urge you to stand with women and families and vote yes on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7). Cosponsorship and votes associated with this bill and amendments may be scored in the AAUW Action Fund Congressional Voting Record for the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH J. VAGINS,
Senior Vice President, Public Policy and Research.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, today, we have this opportunity. Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act and make equal pay for equal work a reality.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend, Ranking Member FOXX.

Madam Chair, there are nearly 75 million women working in the United States, the most in our Nation's history. Thanks to our strong economy, nearly 3 million jobs were created in the last year, and of those jobs, 58 percent went to women.

Women are graduating from college at a higher rate than their male counterparts and are increasingly their family's primary breadwinner. Despite all of these positive economic indicators, there remains evidence that in some cases women do not earn the same levels of compensation as men.

Republicans strongly support equal pay for equal work, and we owe it to women to constructively engage on this important issue and put forward solutions to strengthen existing law.

Democrats have put forth a bill that prioritizes trial attorneys and government regulation over women's economic empowerment. The Democratic bill, for the first time, would require data disclosure to the EEOC that collects compensation data broken down by the sex, race, and national origin of employees, while also tracking the hiring, termination, and promotion data of those employees.

These intrusions into the operations of private businesses would add compliance costs exceeding \$700 million per year. And on top of these onerous new requirements, H.R. 7 is a giveaway to trial attorneys by changing class action formation from opt in, to opt out.

America's businesses will need to prepare for an onslaught of frivolous lawsuits which now will be open to unlimited compensatory and punitive damages.

The bill establishes an impossibly high burden of proof for employers defending the legitimacy of any pay differentials between employees. We need to recognize that in today's modern economy, 40 percent of small businesses are run by women. This bill would make it harder for these women business leaders.

This issue is far too important to leave to partisan solutions. That is why today I am proud to introduce the

Wage Equity Act with over 40 of my colleagues, which offers a stark contrast to the partisan approach laid out in H.R. 7. We looked to innovation in the States to find consensus, bipartisan policies that were supported by both Republicans and Democrats, and signed by Republican Governors, proof that equal pay for equal work is not a partisan issue, and that Republicans are, indeed, leading the way on women's economic opportunity.

The Wage Equity Act is reflective of the modern workforce and supports the empowerment of women in today's economy. Specifically, my legislation allows employees to negotiate voluntary, flexible work arrangements. These dynamic compensation models empower the individual to seek the work arrangement that works best in their own life and for their own family.

America's businesses, in particular our small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy, they seek to do right by their employees. In recognition of this, the Wage Equity Act creates a self-audit system for voluntary pay analysis by businesses.

Under our proposal, a business could and should undergo a pay analysis to proactively rectify pay disparity should it exist. By creating this environment of consistent self-reflection, we can further empower businesses to do what they already seek to do, doing right not only for their employees, but following the law.

Madam Chair, I believe that an individual should be able to negotiate employment based upon their qualifications and merit for the position. I also believe that the victim of wage discrimination at any point in their career should not have to have this discrimination follow them to their next job and compound throughout the rest of their career.

That is why my bill protects the employee's right to not disclose their salary history during the job interview process unless they wish to voluntarily disclose it.

We must acknowledge the compounding impact of wage discrimination on a person's career and be willing to discuss ideas to free employees from this burden.

At the same time, we cannot erode the necessary negotiation that takes place in a job interview or ignore the role wage figures can play in advancement of an individual through their career.

The Wage Equity Act protects the ability for an employee and their prospective employer to have a wage expectation conversation, an important part of any negotiation.

My legislation protects an employee's ability to discuss compensation with their colleagues, while giving the employers the ability to set reasonable limitations on the time, location, and manner of this activity to protect employees from harassment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Chair, furthermore, the Wage Equity Act seeks to put women on equal footing with men as they start their careers.

The legislation provides for a grant program targeted toward women in college and career tech programs to provide negotiation skills education.

Lastly, my bill directs the GAO to study the manager's gap. We know that the wage gap greatly expands for women after they return to the workforce following parental leave. We must have a clear sense of the impact that leave during this time will have on an employee's future earning and opportunity potentials.

These are commonsense proposals that are supported by Democrats and Republicans. I encourage my colleagues to reject Big Government overreach, and find practical, bipartisan solutions that improve and strengthen the existing law of the land: equal pay for equal work.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman SCOTT for his leadership and Representative DELAURO for bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today in strong support of the Paycheck Fairness Act because, like Fannie Lou Hamer and Representative DELAURO, I am sick and tired of being sick and tired of paycheck inequity.

For three decades, from the North Carolina House to the United States Congress, I have been fighting to close the gender wage gap. As the new chair of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am very proud to support this bill. It takes the average woman an additional 91 days to earn what her male peers earned in 2018, and that is unacceptable.

In my district in North Carolina, women still only make about 82 cents for every dollar a man makes. It is even worse for women of color, who are even less likely to make as much as their male counterparts working the same job. Black women earn only 61 cents for every dollar a man makes; Hispanic women only 53 cents.

When we shortchange women, we shortchange our children, our families, and our economy. In fact, women are shortchanged \$500 billion every year. Fifty-six years have passed since the Equal Pay Act was signed into law, and it has been 10 years since President Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Yet, our work remains unfinished. Today, the U.S. House of Representatives speaks loud and clear, and we will no longer wait while women continue to do the same work and not get the same pay. The time is up for that.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from AFSCME which

states that the Paycheck Fairness Act is integral to ensuring women earn the same amount as men for equal work.

AFSCME,

Washington, DC, March 25, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing in support of the "Paycheck Fairness Act" (H.R. 7). This legislation is integral to ensure that women earn the same amount as men for equal work.

To date, women make up almost 47 percent of the workforce in America. Their participation has steadily climbed since the 1970s, and they are completing college and university education at higher rates. The range of occupations women workers hold has also expanded with women making notable gains in professional and managerial occupations. Yet with more than 74.6 million women in the civilian workforce, there is still a gender pay gap between men and women. That's why passage of this bill is necessary. Even with the enormous progress made by women over many decades, women continue to face discrimination that limits their ability to succeed and advance at work.

Fifty-six years after former President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, women earn less than men. While that law along with other civil rights legislation like Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act have helped to narrow the wage gap, it still exists across all occupations, industries, and trade and educational attainment. This shortchanges many working families and creates little upward mobility in compensation to meet basic household needs. Currently, women make only 80 percent of every dollar a man makes in nearly every occupation where there is enough earnings data to compare. This gap in earnings translates into \$10,169 less per year in average earnings. This percentage is even lower for women of color. Black women earn 61 cents, Latina women 53 cents, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women 62 cents, Native women 58 cents, and Asian women 58 cents for every dollar paid to a white man. This trend is not only troubling for women's career and financial success, but it also limits their ability to save for retirement.

Stronger equal pay protections and enforcement measures are essential to ensure that our workplaces treat women fairly and operate free of discrimination on the job. AFSCME strongly supports the "Paycheck Fairness Act" (H.R. 7) and encourages swift passage to alleviate gender-based wage discrimination, and ensure women receive equal pay for equal work.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Ms. ADAMS. By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, we will strengthen the Equal Pay Act. We will bolster the rights of working women, and finally, we will put an end to gender-based wage disparity.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, before I recognize the next speaker, I include in the RECORD a chart which shows that pay discrimination charges filed per year with the EEOC have remained statistically consistent during the George W. Bush, Obama, and Trump administrations.

EEOC EQUAL PAY ACT STATISTICS

EQUAL PAY ACT (EPA) CHARGES FILED WITH
EEOC (AVERAGE PER YEAR)

George W. Bush Administration (FY 2001–2008): 1,036.

Obama Administration (FY 2009–2016): 999.
Trump Administration (FY 2017–2018): 1,031.

EEOC EPA CHARGES RESOLVED* (AVERAGE PER YEAR)

Bush Administration (FY 2001–2008): 959.

Obama Administration (FY 2009–2016): 1,078.

Trump Administration (FY 2017–2018): 1,220.

* EEOC resolves charges in a number of different ways: negotiated settlement, withdrawal of charge upon receipt of desired benefits, successful conciliation, unsuccessful conciliation, a finding of no reasonable cause, or closure for administrative reasons.

LAWSUITS FILED BY EEOC WITH EPA CLAIMS (AVERAGE PER YEAR) (NOTE: NUMBERS DO NOT INCLUDE PRIVATE LITIGATION)

Bush Administration (FY 2001–2008): 9.

Obama Administration (FY 2009–2016): 3.

Trump Administration (FY 2017–2018): 8.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak out against H.R. 7, legislation that places unprecedented restrictions and liability on job creators that will harm the very women it claims to protect.

As a small business owner with over 40 years of experience creating jobs, I know just how hard it can be for employers to find skilled and qualified workers.

With 7.6 million available jobs throughout our Nation, the last thing we need to do is overregulate our businesses, especially when Federal law already makes it illegal to pay different wages to women for equal work.

H.R. 7 dramatically increases liability for employers, eliminates a business owner's ability to contest gender-based pay discrimination cases, expands damages, and encourages frivolous lawsuits.

Furthermore, this partisan bill offers no new protections against pay discrimination in the workplace. Rather, H.R. 7 directly benefits trial lawyers at the expense of working women. Taken as a whole, this bill will very likely limit or obstruct an employer's efforts to recruit, hire, promote workers, and to increase their pay—once again, empty partisan promises from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1430

However, after passing historic tax reform under the Republican-led Congress and eliminating burdensome red tape under the leadership of President Trump, our businesses are continuing to empower women across this country at unprecedented levels.

We have more women working in the U.S. than ever before, nearly 75 million. Women filled nearly 60 percent of the 2.8 million jobs created in the last year. One in five employer businesses nationwide is owned by women, including by my wife of 45 years, Robin.

I need to keep this momentum going, not obstruct employers' efforts to recruit, hire, and promote workers.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote today on H.R. 7.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, as vice chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am so proud that our committee made it a top priority this year to bring the Paycheck Fairness Act to the floor, and I congratulate Chairman SCOTT for his leadership.

This is an issue where the evidence could not be clearer. In Michigan's Ninth District, which I represent, for example, women's median annual wage is more than \$10,000 lower than men's. I don't care how many jobs are created or how many women are working, we need to do something to, at long last, make women's pay equal to men's.

If we allow this gap to persist, we are not just telling women they aren't worth as much as men. We are doing real damage to entire families and to our economy. Failure to tackle the pay gap isn't just discriminatory; it is shockingly shortsighted.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will finally align our treatment of gender discrimination with other established antidiscrimination policies. This is an opportunity to realize equal pay for equal work that we simply cannot afford to miss.

I regret that my good friends across the aisle did not introduce a single bill to strengthen the Equal Pay Act across the 20 years they held the gavel in this Chamber. I hope they will join us today to lift up America's women and families to full equality at long last.

Finally, I include in the RECORD a strong letter of support for H.R. 7 from the AFL-CIO.

AFL-CIO,
March 25, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL-CIO strongly urges your support of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) when it comes to the House floor this week.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a long overdue remedial measure that responds to the demonstrated inadequacies of the 1963 Equal Pay Act. Although the Equal Pay Act made it illegal for employers to pay unequal wages to male and female employees who perform the same work, wage disparities between men and women persist in both the private and public sectors, at every educational level, across the country. Women working full time are paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, and this gap is greater for women of color. While belonging to a union is the surest way to guarantee equal pay on the job—unionized women earn some 27 percent more than do their non-union counterparts—the Paycheck Fairness Act would provide new effective tools to close the wage gap.

The Paycheck Fairness Act provides targeted remedies designed to update the 1963 Equal Pay Act. It requires employers to demonstrate that wage gaps between men and women doing the same work truly result from factors unrelated to gender. It prohibits employers' use of prior salary history in setting pay for new hires and employer retaliation against workers who discuss their pay with coworkers. Last, H.R. 7 brings Equal Pay Act remedies and class action proce-

dures into conformance with those available for other civil rights claims, and strengthens the government's ability to identify and remedy systematic wage discrimination by requiring employers to report pay data to the EEOC.

When women endure pay discrimination, entire families suffer. We urge you to support final passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act (S. 84), and to oppose any amendment that would weaken this important and long overdue legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, while I believe belonging to a union is the surest way to guarantee equal pay on the job, the Paycheck Fairness Act will provide effective new tools to close the wage gap.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. I am a mother and a grandmother. I have raised two boys and one husband. I have owned businesses, managed employees, made payroll, served in the State legislature, and herded buffalo. I don't need any more men trying to tell me that they need to protect me from being paid less. I am perfectly capable of negotiating a fair wage for a fair day's work and choosing exactly what is important to me when making my own decisions.

The bill proposed by my colleagues across the aisle tells young women entering the workforce that they are unable to negotiate for their own jobs or take control of their own life and that they need to be coddled by the government in order to succeed. What arrogance.

We are not some delicate and helpless group that needs men to tell us just how bad we have it and just how much they need to make sure that we are looked after. I can take care of myself, thank you, and so can every single woman in this country. This bill is nothing more than a trial lawyer's dream and a job creator's nightmare.

The Equal Pay Act already makes it illegal to pay unequal wages for equal work. The men can go try to find somebody else who needs their help. In the meantime, I am going to focus on actually helping women earn more by creating good-paying jobs, by growing our economy, and by building a system that allows for flexible work schedules and nurtures entrepreneurship.

We can't legislate respect any more than we can legislate common sense. Women know real respect is earned. We don't need the men's help, and we don't need the government's help. We just need them both to get out of our way.

I wholly oppose this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7,

the Paycheck Fairness Act. I thank Representative DELAUNO for her efforts in continuing to push this bill to fruition.

As chair of the HELP Subcommittee and as an African American woman, I feel very strongly about the issue of pay fairness. Our Nation cannot adequately improve labor conditions without addressing the stark inequities that exist along gender and racial lines. The fact that, on average, women currently earn just 80 cents for every dollar a man earns for the same position and amount of work is just plain wrong and is a disgrace.

By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act and promoting wage parity, we can lift families out of poverty and keep harmful biases out of the workplace. There are too many poor working people in America working two and three jobs to keep their families whole. Research has shown that a woman's level of education and work experience or chosen industry do not necessarily shield her from unfair pay. This problem is widespread and can be found across all sectors of the economy, affecting even the most prepared women.

Economically disadvantaged women are hit extremely hard, as are women of color. There are two Americas, a rich and prosperous America and a poor and struggling America. Black and Latina women earn 61 cents and 53 cents, respectively, for every dollar earned by men who perform the same job—such a discrepancy, such a stark statistic, such a shame. The wage gap is too wide and narrowing much too slowly for Congress not to act.

I strongly support H.R. 7 as a positive step toward correcting this glaring injustice. I reiterate my strong support for H.R. 7, and I urge all my colleagues to vote “yes” for paycheck fairness.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the National Education Association.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
March 26, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our three million members and the 50 million students they serve, we urge you to VOTE YES on the Paycheck Fairness Act of 2019 (H.R. 7). Votes associated with this issue may be included in NEA's Report Card for the 116th Congress.

Equal pay for equal work is NOT today's reality.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that in 2017, the median weekly earnings of full-time, salaried female workers were 82 percent of those of full-time, salaried male workers.

According to AAUW, the pay gap is even bigger for women of color with African Americans earning 61 cents, American Indian/Alaskan natives 58 cents, and Latinas 53 cents for every dollar paid to white men.

The gender pay gap exists in all demographics, all parts of the country, and nearly all occupations—including female-dominated professions like teaching and nursing.

The Institute for Women's Policy Research reports that closing the pay gap would cut the poverty rate for working single mothers in half and lift 2.5 million children out of poverty.

The Paycheck Fairness Act of 2019 would help by:

Requiring employers to demonstrate that gender is NOT the reason they pay employees different amounts to perform the same jobs.

Prohibiting employers from asking job candidates about their salary histories.

Protecting employees from retaliation if they discuss their pay with colleagues.

Strengthening enforcement of equal pay laws by requiring employers to provide to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) data on salaries, promotions, and dismissals, broken down by race and gender.

Putting in place robust remedies for discrimination.

For all of these reasons, we urge you to VOTE YES on H.R. 7.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,

Director of Government Relations.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we have made it clear that we do not believe H.R. 7 is good for working women, but no one has to take our word for it. There are more working women today than ever before.

Here is what many of the job creators who have helped make that a reality have to say about H.R. 7.

The H.R. Policy Association said:

As written, the bill would penalize legitimate, nondiscriminatory pay decisions; impose an unworkable burden of proof on employers that even The Washington Post has said “potentially invites too much intrusion and interference with core business decisions”; and add to the confusing labyrinth of State and local pay history laws.

The National Federation of Independent Business said:

H.R. 7 requires the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue regulations providing for collection of employers’ compensation data. Most small business owners do not have a human resources department or a full-time staff member in charge of reporting and compliance. NFIB members report unreasonable government regulations as their second most important small business problem.

Americans for Tax Reform and the Center for Worker Freedom says: “Unfortunately, this bill would actually likely harm the women the Democrats are claiming to help. If signed into law, the legislation would likely lead to less flexible work schedules for women, fewer incentives for those who work hard, and lower pay for all.”

The National Taxpayers Union said:

Though well-intended, H.R. 7 would not resolve lingering issues of pay discrimination, particularly when safeguards are already available under the Equal Pay and Fair Labor Standards Acts. Instead, under H.R. 7, women could be perceived as a legal liability, ultimately reducing employment opportunities. Rather than impose new regulations that increase the cost of doing business and kill jobs, Congress should remove barriers that limit prosperity for both men and women.

This bill, as my colleagues have said, is a sham, and it simply doesn’t do what my colleagues across the aisle say it will do.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, let me be very clear: Equal pay for equal work has never been a reality for women in America.

Congress recognized this for the first time 56 years ago, before I was even born, when the Equal Pay Act was passed. This was a foundational piece of civil rights legislation. But a half century later, it is clear that the Equal Pay Act isn’t working for everyone, and it isn’t working fast enough.

In my district, for every dollar that men in Naperville or Batavia or McHenry make, women make 71 cents. That is the worst pay gap in Illinois. It means we have to work at least 10 years longer to earn the same lifetime income. At this rate, every woman in America wouldn’t make equal pay for doing the same work for almost 200 years.

In my community in Illinois, the 14th Congressional District isn’t willing to wait that long, and neither are the House Democrats. That is why I am standing here today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of the Paycheck Fairness Act. There is no point in a woman’s life, from childhood to retirement, where the gender pay gap doesn’t hurt her. The Paycheck Fairness Act would take huge, critical steps to fix that.

The Committee on Education and Labor held hearings on the act, and we heard from experts how this bill would do things like lift children out of poverty, contribute billions of dollars to America’s economy, and make sure women have a safer, healthier retirement.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by 315 State, local, and national organizations that support the Paycheck Fairness Act.

VOTE FOR THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

MARCH 25, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As members of a broad coalition of organizations that promote economic opportunity for women and vigorous enforcement of antidiscrimination laws, we strongly urge you to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act when it comes to the House floor for a vote. Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist. This legislation offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle the pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

In January, we celebrated two major accomplishments. First, an historic number of women were sworn into the 116th Congress, many of whom—along with their male colleagues—ran and won on issues central to the economic well-being of families. Second, on January 29, 2019, we commemorated the tenth anniversary of the enactment of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. That vital law rectified the Supreme Court’s harmful decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company*. The law helps to ensure that individuals subjected to unlawful compensation discrimination are able to have their day in court and effectively assert their rights under federal antidiscrimination laws. But the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, critical as it is, is only one step on the path to ensuring women receive equal pay for equal work.

There is no more fitting way to begin this historic Congress than by making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive fair pay. The Paycheck Fairness Act updates and strengthens the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. Among other provisions, this comprehensive bill bars retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages. It closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business justification related to the job. It ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity. It prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job. And it also provides much needed training and technical assistance, as well as data collection and research.

Women are increasingly the primary or co-breadwinner in their families and cannot afford to be shortchanged any longer. Women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, and when we compare women of color to white, non-Hispanic men, the pay gaps are even larger. Moms are paid less than dads. And even when controlling for factors, such as education and experience, the pay gaps persist and start early in women’s careers and contribute to a wealth gap that follows them throughout their lifetimes. These pay gaps can be addressed only if workers have the legal tools necessary to challenge discrimination and when employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law.

It’s time to take the next step toward achieving equal pay. We urge you to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act and encourage your colleagues to do the same, taking up the cause of Lilly Ledbetter and all those who have fought for equal pay.

Sincerely,

9to5, National Association of Working Women:

9to5 California; 9to5 Colorado; 9to5 Georgia; 9to5 Wisconsin.

A Better Balance

ACCESS Women’s Health Justice

Advocacy and Training Center

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Unions (AFL-CIO):

PA AFL-CIO.

African American Ministers In Action

American Association of University Women (AAUW):

AAUW of Alabama; AAUW of Alaska; (AAUW Fairbanks (AK) Branch, AAUW Kodiak (AK) Branch); AAUW of Arizona; AAUW of Arkansas; AAUW of California; AAUW of Colorado; AAUW of Connecticut; AAUW of Delaware; AAUW of District of Columbia (AAUW Washington (DC) Branch, AAUW Capitol Hill (DC) Branch); AAUW of Florida; AAUW of Georgia; AAUW of Hawaii; AAUW of Idaho; AAUW of Illinois; AAUW of Indiana; AAUW of Iowa; AAUW of Kansas; AAUW of Kentucky; AAUW of Louisiana; AAUW of Maine.

AAUW of Maryland; AAUW of Massachusetts; AAUW of Michigan; AAUW of Minnesota; AAUW of Mississippi; AAUW of Missouri; AAUW of Montana; AAUW of Nebraska; AAUW of Nevada; AAUW of New Hampshire; AAUW of New Jersey; AAUW of New Mexico; AAUW of New York; AAUW of North Carolina; AAUW of North Dakota; AAUW of Ohio; AAUW of Oklahoma; AAUW of Oregon; AAUW of Pennsylvania; AAUW of Puerto Rico; AAUW of Rhode Island; AAUW of South Carolina; AAUW of South Dakota;

AAUW of Tennessee; AAUW of Texas; AAUW of Utah; AAUW of Vermont; AAUW of Virginia; AAUW of Washington; AAUW of West Virginia; AAUW of Wyoming.
 American Civil Liberties Union
 American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), AFL-CIO
 American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
 American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
 American Psychological Association
 Americans for Democratic Action
 Anti-Defamation League
 Atlanta Women for Equality
 Bend the Arc: Jewish Action
 Bozeman Business & Professional Women
 California Employment Lawyers Association
 California Federation of Business & Professional Women
 Caring Across Generations
 Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities Catalyst
 Center for Advancement of Public Policy
 Center for American Progress
 Center for Law and Social Policy
 Central Conference of American Rabbis
 Citizen Action of New York
 Clearinghouse on Women's Issues
 Coalition of Labor Union Women:
 California Capital Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Chesapeake Bay Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Chicago Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Derby City Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Grand Prairie/Arlington Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Greater New Jersey Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Greater Oklahoma City Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Houston Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Ohio Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Kentucky State Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Los Angeles Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women.
 Metro Detroit Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Michigan Capitol Area Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Missouri State Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Neshaminy Bucks Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Philadelphia Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Rhode Island Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; San Diego Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Southwestern PA Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; St. Louis Metro Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Western New York Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Western Virginia Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women.
 Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces
 Connecticut Women's Education and Legal Fund (CWEALF)
 Disciples Women
 Ecumenical Poverty Initiative
 Equal Pay Today
 Equal Rights Advocates
 Feminist Majority Foundation
 Friends of the Delaware County Women's Commission
 Futures Without Violence
 Gender Equality Law Center
 Girls For Gender Equity
 Girls Inc.
 Grameen Development Society (GDS)
 Graphic Communications Conference/International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 24M/9N
 Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition
 Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.
 Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters—USA—JPIC

Hope's Door
 Hudson Law PLLC
 Indiana Institute for Working Families
 Interfaith Worker Justice
 International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees
 International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW)
 International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers (SMART) Local 20
 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers—3rd District
 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 29
 International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE)
 International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW)
 JALSA: Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action
 Jewish Women International
 Justice for Migrant Women
 Lambda Legal
 The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights
 League of Women Voters of St. Lawrence County, NY
 Legal Aid At Work
 Main Street Alliance
 Maine Women's Lobby
 McCree Ndjatou, PLLC
 Methodist Federation for Social Action
 MomsRising
 Mississippi Black Women's Roundtable
 NAACP
 National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd
 National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF)
 National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC), AFL-CIO
 National Center for Transgender Equality
 National Committee on Pay Equity
 National Council of Jewish Women
 National Domestic Workers Alliance
 National Education Association
 National Employment Law Project
 National Employment Lawyers Association
 NELA—Georgia; NELA—Houston; NELA—Indiana; NELA—New Jersey; NELA—New York; NELA—Pennsylvania; NELA—Texas.
 National Federation of Business and Professional Women Clubs
 National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund
 National Organization for Women:
 Anne Arundel County NOW; Arlington NOW; Baton Rouge NOW; California NOW; Central Phoenix/Inez Casiano NOW; Charlotte NOW; Chester County NOW; Connecticut NOW; DC NOW; East End NOW; Florida NOW; High Desert NOW; Hollywood NOW; Illinois NOW; Indianapolis NOW; Jacksonville NOW; Louisiana NOW.
 Maryland NOW; Miami NOW; Michigan NOW; Minnesota NOW; Montana NOW; Morris County NOW; North Carolina NOW; Nevada NOW; New Orleans NOW; New York City NOW; New York State NOW; Northern New Jersey NOW; Northwest PA NOW; Oregon NOW; Pennsylvania NOW; Philadelphia NOW; Seattle NOW.
 Seminole County NOW; South Jersey NOW—Alice Paul Chapter; Southwest ID NOW; Southwest PA NOW; Sun Cities/West Valley NOW; Texas State NOW; Washington County NOW; Washington NOW; Washtenaw County NOW; West Pinellas NOW; West Virginia NOW; Westchester NOW; Will County NOW; Williamsport NOW; Wisconsin NOW; Worcester NOW.
 National Partnership for Women & Families
 National Resource Center on Domestic Violence
 National Women's Law Center

National Women's Political Caucus
 NC Women United
 NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice
 New York Paid Leave Coalition
 New York State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
 North Carolina Justice Center
 Oxfam America
 PathWays PA
 People For the American Way
 Planned Parenthood Pennsylvania Advocates
 PowHer NY
 Progressive Maryland
 Public Citizen
 Restaurant Opportunities Centers United
 Service Employees International Union (SEIU):
 SEIU Local 6686.
 SiX Action
 Southwest Women's Law Center
 Texas Business Women Inc.
 Transport Workers Union
 U.S. Women and Cuba Collaboration
 U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce
 UltraViolet
 Union for Reform Judaism
 Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation
 UNITE HERE! Local 57
 United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries
 United Mine Workers of America:
 United Mine Workers of America District Two.
 United Nations Association of the United States
 United State of Women
 United Steelworkers (USW):
 United Steelworkers, District 10; USW Local 1088; L.U. #1088 USW.
 UN Women USNC Metro New York Chapter
 UnidosUS
 Voter Participation Center
 Westminster Presbyterian Church
 Women Employed
 WNY Women's Foundation
 Women of Reform Judaism
 Women's All Points Bulletin, WAPB
 Women's Voices, Women Vote Action Fund
 WomenNC
 Women's Law Project
 Women's Rabbic Network
 YWCA USA:
 YWCA Allentown; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Asheville; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Billings; YWCA of Binghamton & Broome County; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Cambridge; YWCA Central Alabama; YWCA Central Massachusetts; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Contra Costa/Sacramento; YWCA Corpus Christi; YWCA Gettysburg & Adams County; YWCA Great Falls; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Baton Rouge; YWCA Greater Cincinnati; YWCA Greater Harrisburg; YWCA Greater Miami-Dade.
 YWCA of Greater Portland; YWCA of Kauai; YWCA Mahonini Valley; YWCA McLean County; YWCA Metropolitan Phoenix; YWCA Mount Desert Island; YWCA New Hampshire; YWCA of the Niagara Frontier; YWCA Oklahoma City; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Orange County; YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley; YWCA of the Sauk Valley; YWCA Seattle/King/Snohomish; YWCA South Hampton Roads; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA St. Paul; YWCA of Syracuse and Onondaga County; YWCA Tri-County Area; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA of Van Wert County; YWCA of Watsonville; YWCA Western New York; YWCA Westmoreland County; YWCA Yakima.
 Zonta Club of Greater Queens
 Zonta Club of Portland
 Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I also want to acknowledge the hard

work and leadership of Chairman SCOTT, Representative DELAURO, and committee staff on the issue of equal pay.

This is a bipartisan bill with support from both parties. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act and take this important step toward ending gender-based discrimination at work.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, earlier, my colleagues presented some interesting numbers. The wage gap is a truly fascinating subject to study because there are statistics to show it is vast, and there are statistics to show, in many cases, it is virtually nonexistent.

We should note the numbers that really aren't up for debate. There are more working women today than ever before, 74.9 million. A record 2.8 million new jobs were created in the past year, and nearly 60 percent of those jobs are now filled by women. There are more women owning businesses and employing Americans than ever before. That was no accident. Women are the direct beneficiaries of strong economic policy.

They need strong economic policy. They don't want more ways to sue people. They want more freedom to work in the jobs they want.

We are here for women, Madam Chair, not their lawyers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Chair, I am honored to rise today to speak on H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. I am proud to be part of a Congress that is finally taking action to close the gender pay gap. After so many years of inaction on this issue when our Republican colleagues were in the majority, I think it is fair to say that it is about time.

It is hard to imagine that, in this day and age, women could be paid less than a man for doing the same job. But it happens, and it happens often. Statistics show that pay disparity isn't a thing of the past; it is happening today. It isn't just holding women back; it is amplifying racial inequalities across the country.

We often hear the statistics that say women make 80 cents to every dollar that is paid to a man, but those figures are often worse for women of color. Black women are making only 61 cents on the dollar. For Latina women, that is 53 cents. For Native American women, it is 58 cents. Clearly, the pay gap is compounded by a racial gap.

It should be obvious to all of us that this problem extends beyond the workplace.

Madam Chair, you see the impact everywhere you look around our society. Women of color are less likely to have healthcare coverage. They are more

likely to experience hunger. They are less likely to own a home or be fully prepared for retirement.

□ 1445

At the end of the day, those pennies on the dollar add up, and that loss of income is putting women of color at a serious disadvantage.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will take aggressive action to remedy these inequalities and tear down the economic barriers that women of color face. It will do that, in part, by ensuring the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has the information it needs to detect pay discrimination and to identify those additional cross-section biases.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Minnesota an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Chair, I am proud to introduce an amendment with my colleague, Representative BEYER from Virginia, that will ensure that the major employers are required to report that information to that commission. That will go a long way to finally ending the systemic barriers that women and women of color face in this country.

I thank Chair SCOTT and Chair DELAURO. I am really excited to be part of this change-making Congress.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the NAACP in support of this legislation.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, March 25, 2019.

Re: NAACP Strong support for the immediate passage of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The Honorable,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support and vote in favor of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This critical legislation would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which mandated that employers pay equal wages to men and women who perform substantially the same work. The Paycheck Fairness Act closes loopholes in the Equal Pay Act which have diluted its effectiveness in combating unfair and unequal pay. While the Equal Pay Act has helped to narrow the wage gap between men and women in our workforce, significant disparities remain and must be addressed.

Especially in today's economy, more women work outside of the home and their paycheck is a necessary part of their households' resources. Yet all too often women are forced to raise their families on incomes lower than that of male colleagues performing the same jobs. According to 2018 data, women in the United States are typically paid 80 cents for every dollar paid to men. The median annual pay for a woman who holds a full-time, year-round job is \$41,977 while the median annual pay for a man who holds a full-time, year-round job is \$52,146—a difference of \$10,169 per year. The statistics are even worse for women of color.

African-American women make only 61 cents, and Hispanic women only 53 cents, for every dollar earned by white, non-Hispanic men. These gaps translate into a loss of almost \$24,000 a year for African-American women and almost \$28,500 annually for Hispanic women.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a responsible, steady yet aggressive bill. It will help remedy this inequity and close this unacceptable gap. In short, the legislation will protect women and families across America by: protecting against retaliation for discussing salaries with colleagues; prohibiting employers from screening job applicants based on their salary history or requiring salary history during the interview and hiring process; requiring employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons; providing plaintiffs who file sex-based wage discrimination claims under the Equal Pay Act with the same remedies as are available to plaintiffs who file race- or ethnicity-based wage discrimination claims under the 1964 Civil Rights Act; removing obstacles in the Equal Pay Act to facilitate plaintiffs' participation in class action lawsuits that challenge systemic pay discrimination; and creating a negotiation skills training program for women and girls.

I again urge you to do all you can to see that this important legislation is enacted as quickly as possible so that women can begin to have some parity for a day's work. This in turn will help hard working American women, their children and their families gain the economic stability they deserve. Please support the Paycheck Fairness Act and work to eliminate this unacceptable gap in pay.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP
Washington Bureau
& Senior Vice President for Policy and Advocacy.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I am a businessman. I am also the father of three daughters.

I have managed people and managed compensation plans for more than 40 years, and I know that we cannot manage what we do not measure. I agree with my friend, the Republican congresswoman from New York, that men and women should be paid equally for equal work. This should be a bedrock principle of our democracy.

But if we don't gather the data, how will we ever know if there is paycheck fairness?

My middle daughter is a computer programmer—well paid. She was dismayed to learn around Christmastime that her male counterparts doing exactly the same work were making more money.

It is a fiction that this will be a burden on employers with more than 100 employees. Absolutely none of these employers have not digitized their paycheck process decades ago. The collection of this data requires a keystroke; that is all. All the data, already there, already gathered.

Pay transparency is the most powerful way to achieve paycheck fairness.

Men and women together are outraged when they see actual measured pay unfairness. But where incomes are most fair, where they are most transparent—in the military and in government—paycheck inequity is small or even nonexistent.

This is not a bill for lawyers. This is a bill for business owners and business managers who want to do the right thing and now will have the data to do that right thing.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for yielding.

I have left the chair, where I had been presiding, to speak on my bill, which is included in H.R. 7. My bill is Pay Equity for All, to bar an employer from asking about a person's prior pay.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank all of you who have led this bill to where we are today. I also am very much for the bill in which my bill is included, H.R. 7, which includes class actions, for example, the clarification for which has been most needed.

Expanding this bill is personal for me. I was the first woman to chair the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and enforce the Equal Pay Act, expanding it during my term at the commission.

I, therefore, am very grateful to my good friend ROSA DELAURO, a great champion of equal pay, for including my Pay Equity for All Act in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, many employers may not recognize that they are discriminating against women because they may not intentionally do so. But setting wages based on salary history is routinely done in the workplace, perhaps even by some in the Congress, and it reinforces the wage gap and may be the most important reason for the persistence of the wage gap that we have been unable to unlock.

What it means is that historically disadvantaged groups—women and minorities in particular—often start their careers with unfair and artificially low wages compared to their White male counterparts. This then gets imbedded—this discrimination—and compounded throughout their careers, so they never catch up with their male counterparts.

Job offers ought to be based on an applicant's skill and merit, not past salary or salary history.

My bill keeps an employer from asking applicants for their salary history or their salary in the last job during the interview process or as a condition of employment.

One study has shown, if you don't ask this question, wages are set at 9 percent higher. Therefore, this bill is a very important component of bridging the wage gap.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, the chairman of the full committee, I acknowledge the ranking member, and indicate that, as all of us who have come to the floor, this is an enormously historic day.

For those of us who know the history of equal pay for women in America, this is a journey long in coming and continuing—first with the Equal Pay Act of some 50-plus years ago; then with the Lilly Ledbetter Act 10 years ago; and now with this historic legislation, the Paycheck Fairness Act—to make good on the idea that women should not be getting less than their male counterparts: African American women earning 61 percent, Latina women earning 53 percent, and Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders earning 62 percent versus White, non-Hispanic men.

The most important part of this legislation is the protection given to women today, requiring employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons other than sex. It bans retaliation against workers who wish to discuss their wages. It removes obstacles in the Equal Pay Act to allow workers to participate in class-action lawsuits and improves the Department of Labor tools for enforcing the Equal Pay Act.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, it is important to note that no one, as a woman, can ask you what your previous pay was—how denigrating that is—and use it as a basis to not pay you what you really deserve in this new position.

Also, women are heads of household; they deserve the ability to provide for their family.

Madam Chair, this is not a lawsuit bill. This is an opportunity bill. This is a fairness bill. This is the ability to go into court to receive justice. And, yes, as part of justice, class-action lawsuits can work.

I believe that the Paycheck Fairness Act should be passed, promptly going to the other body, and be signed by the President of the United States, because women, too, have the responsibilities to serve and provide for their family.

This is an historic piece of legislation. I thank ROSA DELAURO.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in 1963, when the Equal Pay Act was signed into law,

women earned 59 cents on the dollar compared to men.

In the 56 years since, that gap has only closed by 21 cents. Women still make only 80 cents on the dollar compared to their male counterparts and earn less than men in nearly every single occupation.

The pay gap is even more extreme for women of color. Over the course of an entire career, that gap results in women losing millions of dollars in earnings compared to their male counterparts.

In today's economy, in which women make up more than half of the workforce and are the sole or co-breadwinner in half of American families, that is simply unacceptable.

Being paid fairly for your work is a fundamental issue of fairness and freedom. Pay disparity can limit women's career choices and their financial independence, but equal pay enables women to save for retirement, to build careers, to buy homes, and to support their families.

Today, I am proud to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act, legislation I have cosponsored in every Congress since 1997.

This legislation gets us closer, at last, to fulfilling the promise of equal pay for equal work and finally ensuring that women have the ability to fight back against wage discrimination and close the wage gap.

I wish to thank Chairman SCOTT for including language in this bill that mirrors legislation I introduced with Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON to address how employers use salary history.

Many women and minorities start their careers with unfair and artificially low salaries compared to their White male counterparts. That discrepancy can be compounded from job to job, when employers rely heavily on salary history in compensation packages.

This change will help ensure that women's pay is based on their merit and not on the past discrimination of other employers.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to finish the work of closing the wage gap.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I have worked for most of my life. I entered the workforce as a young woman, not because I wanted to but because I had to. I knew the burden of poverty well. If I didn't work to support myself, if I didn't contribute to my family income, we would go hungry.

Well, I have been enormously blessed to have gone from working for survival to working for pleasure and, I hope, a greater purpose. I know there are millions of women of all ages in this country today who must work to survive, just as I did.

When I entered the workforce, equal pay for equal work—equal pay for

women—was a demand, but not yet the law. Today, it is the law. The Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act are clear that pay discrimination is wrong, it is unacceptable, and it is illegal.

Managers who discriminate on the basis of sex are breaking at least two Federal laws, and they have no excuses.

No one should operate under the assumption that women have reached their full potential in the workplace.

Over the years, I have experienced sexism and misogyny. I have seen unfairness. I have seen, also, remarkable advancement, and I have remained disappointed in many ways.

So, for the sake of all the working women I have known and know now, women who work because they choose to and women who work because they must, I looked for anything in this legislation worthy of their support. I found that this bill wasn't written for their sake at all.

This bill is a cynical political ploy that borders on paternalism. There is not a single new or strengthened legal protection against pay discrimination for working women in H.R. 7.

□ 1500

This bill is entirely designed for trial lawyers, and Democrats must think women are too dumb to understand what they have done.

It is an insult to women everywhere that Democrats are passing this bill off as something good for them. This bill is like every other cheap product in drugstores and supermarkets across America that has been covered in pink packaging, marketed as the solution women have been waiting for, and sold for twice what it is worth.

We know women are smarter than that. Democrats, who have assumed that women will always follow their agenda, realize they are running out of time, and that is why they have stooped to a stunt like H.R. 7.

Women in America are embracing their power and potential in ways they never have before. I am not talking about the record number of women in Congress. I am talking about the historic, groundbreaking number of women in the workforce.

More than half of the record number of new jobs created in the past year have gone to women. More women are stepping up to start and lead businesses, to be job creators themselves, than ever before.

Women need Representatives in Washington who will cheer for them, not their rich lawyers. If Democrats want to champion a bill to make life easier for trial lawyers, that is their choice, but they should be honest about it and, for once, bypass the opportunity to talk down to hardworking women everywhere.

For the women who work today because they must, I am glad they have the legal protections I didn't when I was in their shoes. It was women like them who paved the way for suffrage a

century ago. It was women like them who made equal pay for equal work the law of the land, and it is women like them, today and tomorrow, who will continue to clarify, to sharpen, and to exemplify what "a more perfect Union" was always supposed to look like. This House should follow their lead.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire how much time I have left.

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Chair, I just want to make a couple of closing comments.

We have heard speaker after speaker complain that, if this bill passes, lawyers will get paid. Most lawyers, in fact, only get paid when they have a winning case; so if they want lawyers to stop getting paid, they could do this if we would stop discriminating.

The only way to enforce the laws against discrimination is to hire a lawyer and go to court, and that is when lawyers get paid. Stop the discrimination; stop the lawyers from getting paid.

There is also a suggestion that we ought to limit the amount of money that can be paid to lawyers. The fact is that no group supporting women support that limitation because the limitation sometimes can be so low that you can't hire a lawyer. It is only supported by groups supporting those representing people accused of discrimination.

It is also one-sided. There is no proposal to limit the amount of money that the guilty can pay their lawyers.

A comment was made about unlimited damages. The damages, in fact, in this bill are the same as you can get under race and religious discrimination, and the purpose of the bill is to conform the process for gender discrimination to the process for other forms of discrimination like race and religion.

The EEOC data, as my colleague from Virginia pointed out, is available, and if you do not report this data, you could have gross disparities. You could pay all the men one thing and all the women less, and until that is reported, nobody might notice.

Madam Chair, there are pay gaps. Discrimination still exists, and this legislation is one step in closing that pay gap. We need to pass the legislation.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, our Republican colleagues say the Paycheck Fairness Act is unnecessary, a boom for trial attorneys and a burden on employers, but once again the latest numbers tell a different story. American women continue to lag far behind fair pay for equal work.

The latest numbers from the U.S. Census Bureau once again revealed that American

women working full-time, year-round, are typically paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. The pay gaps are even more severe for women of color: 61 cents for African American women and 53 cents for Latina women.

Women take home less money than they have rightfully earned in every industry, no matter what they do, how high their level of education, or where they are from.

Not only is this a matter of basic equality, economic justice and freedom, it also compounds and is a significant issue impacting women's retirement security.

The Paycheck Fairness Act provides a long-overdue remedy to the 1963 Equal Pay Act. It will give women the tools needed to successfully challenge pay discrimination and to incentivize employers to comply with the law.

I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. The purpose of this legislation is simple: ensuring all women are rewarded with equal pay for equal work. The landmark Equal Pay Act of 1963 has helped us to achieve progress in this crucial policy area, but the Equal Pay Act, enacted over a half-century ago, is out of date and out of touch with today's business world. The Paycheck Fairness Act makes necessary and common-sense improvements to this historic law so that we can take another step toward eradicating gender-based wage discrimination.

Most importantly, this bill seeks to make equal pay a reality for women of color. Race and gender wage gaps harm not just the economic security of women but also of their families. A woman of color who works full time, year round, can lose more than \$1 million in income over a 40-year career because of the wage gap. Currently, black women earn \$0.60 for every dollar earned by their white male counterparts. Native American women earn \$0.57 to every dollar, and Latina women earn \$0.54. Meanwhile, white women and Asian women earn \$0.79 and \$0.87, respectively. This wage gap has not improved for years and continues to squeeze women's pocketbooks, erode their earning potential, and deprive them of the means to improve their own lives and support their families.

It is long past time to update the Equal Pay Act to give working women the legal tools they need to challenge sex-based pay discrimination and to encourage employers to comply with the law. The Paycheck Fairness Act sets forth a path toward achieving those goals.

I urge members of the House to pass this critical legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act—a modest, common-sense solution to the problem of pay inequity.

Equal pay for equal work is not only a core value of mine and others—it's the law. Full implementation of that principle, however, remains elusive.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, which was first introduced in 1997 and passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support in 2009, is a serious initiative to realize the noble goal of true equality.

Among its provisions, this legislation would: Encourage businesses to rely on information about the market value of a position, industry standards, the duties of the job, and their

budgets in order to set salaries, by prohibiting reliance on the prior salary history of prospective employees.

Allow workers to share their personal salary information free from retaliation, with common-sense exceptions for FIR professionals.

Improve research on the gender pay gap by instructing Department of Labor (DOL) to conduct studies and review available research and data to provide information on how to identify, correct, and eliminate illegal wage disparities.

Assist the DOL in uncovering wage discrimination by requiring the collection of wage data from federal contractors, and direct the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to conduct a survey of available wage information and create a system of wage data collection.

Support small businesses with technical assistance by providing support to all businesses to help them with their equal pay practices.

Momentum has continued to build, with more than 260 diverse organizations signing a letter in support of the bill, including the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, which represents business associations and groups across the country, and the Main Street Alliance, a national network of small business owners.

Madam Chair, according to the National Partnership for Women and Families, if the disparity in median annual earnings for women and men working full-time, year-round were closed, women would have over \$10,000 more in earnings each year. For millennial women, closing this gender wage gap could add up to more than \$1,000,000 in lost income over a career.

This not only impacts these women immensely, but also directly impacts those with families. Over 62 percent of two-parent, married households with children, have both parents employed, which means these families would add \$10,000 more to their family's total earnings per year.

Madam Chair, this bill makes good economic sense. Companies are recognizing the benefits and the power of women's increased economic participation, and some have already enacted policies similar to those outlined in the Paycheck Fairness Act. Companies like Staples and Amazon have ended inquiries into job applicants' salary histories to avoid importing prior pay discrimination into their wage setting process. These moves are directly aligned with the Paycheck Fairness Act's provision banning reliance on salary history in determining future pay, so that prior pay discrimination doesn't follow workers from job to job.

We have also seen a movement, spearheaded by investors, to motivate companies to disclose their pay data. After a gender pay shareholder proposal from the investment management firm Arjuna Capital, Citigroup publicly released the results of its pay equity review in 2018 covering a third of its global workforce, and another, more comprehensive review, in 2019. This data release went even further than the Paycheck Fairness Act's provisions, which would only require that companies give this summary information to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), not the public.

According to a 2017 report from the Institute for Women's Policy Research, the poverty rate for all working women would be cut in half if

women were paid the same as men. The same study indicates the U.S. economy would have produced an additional \$512.6 billion in income if women had received equal pay for equal work. With 64 percent of mothers being the primary, sole, or co-breadwinners of their families, equal pay for women means America's families are better off.

Ensuring women have equal pay would have a significant positive impact on our families and our economy and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-8 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 7

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Paycheck Fairness Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Women have entered the workforce in record numbers over the past 50 years.

(2) Despite the enactment of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, many women continue to earn significantly lower pay than men for equal work. These pay disparities exist in both the private and governmental sectors.

(3) In many instances, the pay disparities can only be due to continued intentional discrimination or the lingering effects of past discrimination. After controlling for educational attainment, occupation, industry, union status, race, ethnicity, and labor force experience roughly 40 percent of the pay gap remains unexplained.

(4) The existence of such pay disparities—

(A) depresses the wages of working families who rely on the wages of all members of the family to make ends meet;

(B) undermines women's retirement security, which is often based on earnings while in the workforce;

(C) prevents women from realizing their full economic potential, particularly in terms of labor force participation and attachment;

(D) has been spread and perpetuated, through commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce, among the workers of the several States;

(E) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce;

(F) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce;

(G) tends to cause labor disputes, as evidenced by the tens of thousands of charges filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission against employers between 2010 and 2016;

(H) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce; and

(I) in many instances, may deprive workers of equal protection on the basis of sex in violation of the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution.

(5)(A) Artificial barriers to the elimination of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex continue to exist decades after the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.).

(B) These barriers have resulted, in significant part, because the Equal Pay Act of 1963 has not worked as Congress originally intended. Improvements and modifications to the law are necessary to ensure that the Act provides effective protection to those subject to pay discrimination on the basis of their sex.

(C) Elimination of such barriers would have positive effects, including—

(i) providing a solution to problems in the economy created by unfair pay disparities;

(ii) substantially reducing the number of working women earning unfairly low wages, thereby reducing the dependence on public assistance;

(iii) promoting stable families by enabling all family members to earn a fair rate of pay;

(iv) remedying the effects of past discrimination on the basis of sex and ensuring that in the future workers are afforded equal protection on the basis of sex; and

(v) ensuring equal protection pursuant to Congress' power to enforce the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution.

(6) The Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission carry out functions to help ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

(7) The Department of Labor is responsible for—

(A) collecting and making publicly available information about women's pay;

(B) ensuring that companies receiving Federal contracts comply with anti-discrimination affirmative action requirements of Executive Order 11246 (relating to equal employment opportunity);

(C) disseminating information about women's rights in the workplace;

(D) helping women who have been victims of pay discrimination obtain a remedy; and

(E) investigating and prosecuting systemic gender based pay discrimination involving government contractors.

(8) The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is the primary enforcement agency for claims made under the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and issues regulations and guidance on appropriate interpretations of the law.

(9) Vigorous implementation by the Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, increased information as a result of the amendments made by this Act, wage data, and more effective remedies, will ensure that women are better able to recognize and enforce their rights.

(10) Certain employers have already made great strides in eradicating unfair pay disparities in the workplace and their achievements should be recognized.

SEC. 3. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF EQUAL PAY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BONA FIDE FACTOR DEFENSE AND MODIFICATION OF SAME ESTABLISHMENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 6(d)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "No employer having" and inserting "(A) No employer having";

(2) by striking "any other factor other than sex" and inserting "a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience"; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

"(B) The bona fide factor defense described in subparagraph (A)(iv) shall apply only if the employer demonstrates that such factor (i) is not based upon or derived from a sex-based differential in compensation; (ii) is job-related with respect to the position in question; (iii) is consistent with business necessity; and (iv) accounts for the entire differential in compensation at issue. Such defense shall not apply

where the employee demonstrates that an alternative employment practice exists that would serve the same business purpose without producing such differential and that the employer has refused to adopt such alternative practice.

“(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), employees shall be deemed to work in the same establishment if the employees work for the same employer at workplaces located in the same county or similar political subdivision of a State. The preceding sentence shall not be construed as limiting broader applications of the term ‘establishment’ consistent with rules prescribed or guidance issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.”.

(b) **NONRETALIATION PROVISION.**—Section 15 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “employee has filed” and all that follows and inserting “employee—

“(A) has made a charge or filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under or related to this Act, including an investigation conducted by the employer, or has testified or is planning to testify or has assisted or participated in any manner in any such investigation, proceeding, hearing or action, or has served or is planning to serve on an industry committee; or

“(B) has inquired about, discussed, or disclosed the wages of the employee or another employee;”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) to require an employee to sign a contract or waiver that would prohibit the employee from disclosing information about the employee’s wages.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Subsection (a)(3)(B) shall not apply to instances in which an employee who has access to the wage information of other employees as a part of such employee’s essential job functions discloses the wages of such other employees to individuals who do not otherwise have access to such information, unless such disclosure is in response to a complaint or charge or in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under section 6(d), including an investigation conducted by the employer. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the rights of an employee provided under any other provision of law.”.

(c) **ENHANCED PENALTIES.**—Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “Any employer who violates section 6(d) shall additionally be liable for such compensatory damages, or, where the employee demonstrates that the employer acted with malice or reckless indifference, punitive damages as may be appropriate, except that the United States shall not be liable for punitive damages.”;

(2) in the sentence beginning “An action to”, by striking “the preceding sentences” and inserting “any of the preceding sentences of this subsection”;

(3) in the sentence beginning “No employees shall”, by striking “No employees” and inserting “Except with respect to class actions brought to enforce section 6(d), no employee”;

(4) by inserting after the sentence referred to in paragraph (3), the following: “Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, any action brought to enforce section 6(d) may be maintained as a class action as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”; and

(5) in the sentence beginning “The court in”—

(A) by striking “in such action” and inserting “in any action brought to recover the liability prescribed in any of the preceding sentences of this subsection”;

(B) by inserting before the period the following: “; including expert fees”.

(d) **ACTION BY SECRETARY.**—Section 16(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting “or, in the case of a violation of section 6(d), additional compensatory or punitive damages, as described in subsection (b),” before “and the agreement”; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: “; or such compensatory or punitive damages, as appropriate”;

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “and, in the case of a violation of section 6(d), additional compensatory or punitive damages, as described in subsection (b)”;

(3) in the third sentence, by striking “the first sentence” and inserting “the first or second sentence”; and

(4) in the sixth sentence—

(A) by striking “commenced in the case” and inserting “commenced—

“(1) in the case”;

(B) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) in the case of a class action brought to enforce section 6(d), on the date on which the individual becomes a party plaintiff to the class action.”.

SEC. 4. TRAINING.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, subject to the availability of funds appropriated under section 11, shall provide training to Commission employees and affected individuals and entities on matters involving discrimination in the payment of wages.

SEC. 5. NEGOTIATION SKILLS TRAINING.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Education, is authorized to establish and carry out a grant program.

(2) **GRANTS.**—In carrying out the program, the Secretary of Labor may make grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out negotiation skills training programs for the purposes of addressing pay disparities, including through outreach to women and girls.

(3) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall be a public agency, such as a State, a local government in a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget), a State educational agency, or a local educational agency, a private nonprofit organization, or a community-based organization.

(4) **APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary of Labor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary of Labor may require.

(5) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall use the funds made available through the grant to carry out an effective negotiation skills training program for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(b) **INCORPORATING TRAINING INTO EXISTING PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall issue regulations or policy guidance that provides for integrating the negotiation skills training, to the extent practicable, into programs authorized under—

(1) in the case of the Secretary of Education, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), and other programs carried out by the Department of Education that the Secretary of Education determines to be appropriate; and

(2) in the case of the Secretary of Labor, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.), and other programs carried

out by the Department of Labor that the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the activities conducted under this section and evaluating the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall conduct studies and provide information to employers, labor organizations, and the general public concerning the means available to eliminate pay disparities between men and women, including—

(1) conducting and promoting research to develop the means to correct expeditiously the conditions leading to the pay disparities;

(2) publishing and otherwise making available to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, educational institutions, the media, and the general public the findings resulting from studies and other materials, relating to eliminating the pay disparities;

(3) sponsoring and assisting State, local, and community informational and educational programs;

(4) providing information to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, and other interested persons on the means of eliminating the pay disparities; and

(5) recognizing and promoting the achievements of employers, labor organizations, and professional associations that have worked to eliminate the pay disparities.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL AWARD FOR PAY EQUITY IN THE WORKPLACE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Secretary of Labor’s National Award for Pay Equity in the Workplace, which shall be awarded, on an annual basis, to an employer to encourage proactive efforts to comply with section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)), as amended by this Act.

(b) **CRITERIA FOR QUALIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Labor shall set criteria for receipt of the award, including a requirement that an employer has made substantial effort to eliminate pay disparities between men and women, and deserves special recognition as a consequence of such effort. The Secretary shall establish procedures for the application and presentation of the award.

(c) **BUSINESS.**—In this section, the term “employer” includes—

(1)(A) a corporation, including a nonprofit corporation;

(B) a partnership;

(C) a professional association;

(D) a labor organization; and

(E) a business entity similar to an entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (D);

(2) an entity carrying out an education referral program, a training program, such as an apprenticeship or management training program, or a similar program; and

(3) an entity carrying out a joint program, formed by a combination of any entities described in paragraph (1) or (2).

SEC. 8. COLLECTION OF PAY INFORMATION BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.

Section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-8) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall provide for the collection from employers of compensation data and other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) disaggregated by the sex, race, and ethnic identity of employees.

“(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Commission shall have as its primary consideration the most effective and efficient means for enhancing the enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination. For this purpose, the Commission shall consider factors including the imposition of burdens on employers, the frequency of required reports (including the size of employers required to prepare reports), appropriate protections for maintaining data confidentiality, and the most effective format to report such data.

“(3)(A) For each 12-month reporting period for an employer, the compensation data collected under paragraph (1) shall include, for each range of taxable compensation described in subparagraph (B), disaggregated by the categories described in subparagraph (E)—

“(i) the number of employees of the employer who earn taxable compensation in an amount that falls within such taxable compensation range; and

“(ii) the total number of hours worked by such employees.

“(B) Subject to adjustment under subparagraph (C), the taxable compensation ranges described in this subparagraph are as follows:

“(i) Not more than \$19,239.

“(ii) Not less than \$19,240 and not more than \$24,439.

“(iii) Not less than \$24,440 and not more than \$30,679.

“(iv) Not less than \$30,680 and not more than \$38,999.

“(v) Not less than \$39,000 and not more than \$49,919.

“(vi) Not less than \$49,920 and not more than \$62,919.

“(vii) Not less than \$62,920 and not more than \$80,079.

“(viii) Not less than \$80,080 and not more than \$101,919.

“(ix) Not less than \$101,920 and not more than \$128,959.

“(x) Not less than \$128,960 and not more than \$163,799.

“(xi) Not less than \$163,800 and not more than \$207,999.

“(xii) Not less than \$208,000.

“(C) The Commission may adjust the taxable compensation ranges under subparagraph (B)—

“(i) if the Commission determines that such adjustment is necessary to enhance enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination; or

“(ii) for inflation, in consultation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

“(D) In collecting data described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Commission shall provide that, with respect to an employee who the employer is not required to compensate for overtime employment under section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207), an employer may report—

“(i) in the case of a full-time employee, that such employee works 40 hours per week, and in the case of a part-time employee, that such employee works 20 hours per week; or

“(ii) the actual number of hours worked by such employee.

“(E) The categories described in this subparagraph shall be determined by the Commission and shall include—

“(i) race;

“(ii) ethnic identity;

“(iii) sex; and

“(iv) job categories, including the job categories described in the instructions for the Equal Employment Opportunity Employer Information Report EEO-1, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(F) The Commission shall use the compensation data collected under paragraph (1)—

“(i) to enhance—

“(I) the investigation of charges filed under section 706 or section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)); and

“(II) the allocation of resources to investigate such charges; and

“(ii) for any other purpose that the Commission determines appropriate.

“(G) The Commission shall annually make publicly available aggregate compensation data collected under paragraph (1) for the categories described in subparagraph (E), disaggregated by industry, occupation, and core based statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget).”.

SEC. 9. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY EQUITY PROGRAMS AND PAY EQUITY DATA COLLECTION.

(a) **BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS DATA COLLECTION.**—The Commissioner of Labor Statistics shall continue to collect data on women workers in the Current Employment Statistics survey.

(b) **OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS INITIATIVES.**—The Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs shall ensure that employees of the Office—

(1)(A) shall use the full range of investigatory tools at the Office's disposal, including pay grade methodology;

(B) in considering evidence of possible compensation discrimination—

(i) shall not limit its consideration to a small number of types of evidence; and

(ii) shall not limit its evaluation of the evidence to a small number of methods of evaluating the evidence; and

(C) shall not require a multiple regression analysis or anecdotal evidence for a compensation discrimination case;

(2) for purposes of its investigative, compliance, and enforcement activities, shall define “similarly situated employees” in a way that is consistent with and not more stringent than the definition provided in item 1 of subsection A of section 10–III of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Compliance Manual (2000), and shall consider only factors that the Office's investigation reveals were used in making compensation decisions; and

(3) shall implement a survey to collect compensation data and other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) and designate not less than half of all nonconstruction contractor establishments each year to prepare and file such survey, and shall review and utilize the responses to such survey to identify contractor establishments for further evaluation and for other enforcement purposes as appropriate.

(c) **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR DISTRIBUTION OF WAGE DISCRIMINATION INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Labor shall make readily available (in print, on the Department of Labor website, and through any other forum that the Department may use to distribute compensation discrimination information), accurate information on compensation discrimination, including statistics, explanations of employee rights, historical analyses of such discrimination, instructions for employers on compliance, and any other information that will assist the public in understanding and addressing such discrimination.

SEC. 10. PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES' SALARY AND BENEFIT HISTORY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

“SEC. 8. REQUIREMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO WAGE, SALARY, AND BENEFIT HISTORY.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall be an unlawful practice for an employer to—

“(1) rely on the wage history of a prospective employee in considering the prospective employee for employment, including requiring that a prospective employee's prior wages satisfy minimum or maximum criteria as a condition of being considered for employment;

“(2) rely on the wage history of a prospective employee in determining the wages for such prospective employee, except that an employer may

rely on wage history if it is voluntarily provided by a prospective employee, after the employer makes an offer of employment with an offer of compensation to the prospective employee, to support a wage higher than the wage offered by the employer;

“(3) seek from a prospective employee or any current or former employer the wage history of the prospective employee, except that an employer may seek to confirm prior wage information only after an offer of employment with compensation has been made to the prospective employee and the prospective employee responds to the offer by providing prior wage information to support a wage higher than that offered by the employer; or

“(4) discharge or in any other manner retaliate against any employee or prospective employee because the employee or prospective employee—

“(A) opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this section; or

“(B) took an action for which discrimination is forbidden under section 15(a)(3).

“(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘wage history’ means the wages paid to the prospective employee by the prospective employee's current employer or previous employer.”.

(b) **PENALTIES.**—Section 16 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Any person who violates the provisions of section 8 shall—

“(A) be subject to a civil penalty of \$5,000 for a first offense, increased by an additional \$1,000 for each subsequent offense, not to exceed \$10,000; and

“(B) be liable to each employee or prospective employee who was the subject of the violation for special damages not to exceed \$10,000 plus attorneys' fees, and shall be subject to such injunctive relief as may be appropriate.

“(2) An action to recover the liability described in paragraph (1)(B) may be maintained against any employer (including a public agency) in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees or prospective employees for and on behalf of—

“(A) the employees or prospective employees; and

“(B) other employees or prospective employees similarly situated.”.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.**—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for purposes of the grant program in section 5 of this Act may be used for a congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 12. SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MATERIALS.**—The Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall jointly develop technical assistance material to assist small enterprises in complying with the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) **SMALL BUSINESSES.**—A small enterprise shall be exempt from the provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, to the same extent that such enterprise is exempt from the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) pursuant to clauses (i) and (ii) of section 3(s)(1)(A) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 203(s)(1)(A)).

SEC. 13. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in any amendments made by this Act, shall affect the obligation of employers and employees to fully comply with all applicable immigration laws, including being

subject to any penalties, fines, or other sanctions.

SEC. 14. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of that provision or amendment to particular persons or circumstances is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-19. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 2016, the Obama administration proposed adding employee pay data to the EEO-1 report, which is filed by certain employers specifying employee data by job category, ethnicity, race, and sex.

After strong concerns were raised about this misguided proposal by congressional Republicans, the Office of Management and Budget stopped it from going forward in August 2017. A Federal district court recently overturned OMB's stay on the data collection, which the administration will likely appeal.

The Obama administration scheme would have imposed an extremely costly and uniquely burdensome mandate on business owners, providing reams of proprietary data to the government for uses which were never adequately explained.

The Obama EEO-1 mandate would have increased the data fields provided by employers in each EEO report twentyfold, from 180 to 3,660. It was also estimated that adding employee pay data to the EEO-1 form would have brought the overall cost to employers of submitting the report to approximately \$700 million annually.

It is appropriate to compare the pay data collection provisions in H.R. 7 to the 2016 Obama scheme because H.R. 7, as modified by the Scott amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, codifies much of the 2016 Obama administration mandate. In fact, H.R. 7 now includes 12 pay bands, the same number as in the Obama mandate, at the exact dollar amounts that were part of the Obama mandate.

Incredibly, H.R. 7's employee pay data mandate is even more extreme than the Obama proposal. In addition to collecting reams of employee pay data, the bill requires the EEOC to collect hiring, termination, and promotion data. How the EEOC would collect this kind of data and how business owners would comply is anyone's guess.

As with the previous scheme to expand the EEO-1, H.R. 7's provision raises many concerns. For one, H.R. 7 would pose significant threats to the confidentiality and privacy of employee pay data. For instance, the EEOC shares the EEO-1 data with the Department of Labor, which, in certain situations, might release data even if the EEOC would not.

Moreover, time and again we have seen massive and harmful data breaches of Federal agencies. Requiring the EEOC to collect pay data would create yet another valuable target, and H.R. 7 fails to adequately address the need for protection of employee data.

As with the Obama EEO-1 scheme, I also have concern regarding the data's lack of usefulness and whether the EEOC would be able to appropriately manage and interpret the massive amounts of employee pay data it would collect. I have already mentioned the burden of such a collection on employers.

For all these reasons, this amendment strikes the invasive, risky, and burdensome provision requiring the EEOC to collect employee compensation data from employers broken down by race, sex, and ethnicity. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Chair, before addressing the pending amendment, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his leadership and also express my profound appreciation for my friend from Connecticut. She has been a tireless champion over the years for equal pay on behalf of those who have been discriminated against unfairly.

Madam Chair, I imagine that most of us agree that unfair pay discrimination needs to be stopped. Unfortunately, despite the progress we have made in offering greater opportunities to more and more Americans, pay discrimina-

tion persists, and, at times, it occurs in stealth ways that cannot be easily detected. That, in fact, is a key reason why I oppose this amendment.

Keeping this bill intact is necessary to prevent the kind of unfair discrimination that occurs when one employee is compensated less than another despite doing the same job just as well for just as long and with the same credentials.

I worked in the private sector for 13 years before coming to Congress. I know firsthand that unfair pay disparities still occur.

Across industries, I worked with employers to confront this inequality, to bring more women to the decision-making table and create work environments where people of any sex, gender, race, or ethnicity were truly empowered.

Pay discrimination derails a workplace. It holds back talent and undermines trust, a toxic mix for any business.

A key component of the Paycheck Fairness Act requires that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission collect wage data, disaggregated by sex, race, and national origin. This provision is particularly necessary to respond to the administration's attempt to block the EEOC from collecting data.

Earlier this month, the National Women's Law Center won an important case to reinstate the EEOC's ability to collect this data. Nevertheless, attacks on collecting data of this type continue. We should not make it easier to hide pay discrimination.

This provision is necessary to ensure that equal work does, in fact, lead to equal pay. It will reveal trends in hiring, compensation, and advancement, and it will expose sex-segregated jobs, and unequal salaries, benefits, or bonuses.

This provision is a critical component of the bill, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and keep the bill intact.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers in support of this legislation.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, On behalf of the 90,000 members represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), we are writing in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. Sponsored by Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, this legislation will amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of gender-based discrimination in the payment of wages. With a floor vote scheduled this week, IFPTE urges you to vote for H.R. 7.

Today, women earn 80 cents to every one dollar earned by their male counterparts. It is even worse for African-American women, who earn only 61 cents on the dollar compared to white non-Hispanic men, while Hispanic and Latina women earn only 53 cents

on the dollar compared to white non-Hispanic men. While these glaring differences should be unacceptable in any day and age, the impact is even greater today with poverty rates among women recently reaching their highest peak in nearly two decades.

The problem of unequal pay for equal work spans every sector and all educational levels. According to a 2017 Department of Professional Employees (DPE, AFL-CIO) fact sheet, *Professional Women: A Gendered Look at Inequality in the U.S. Workforce*, women with a bachelor's degree or higher earned \$1,230 in median weekly wages in 2015, while men with a comparable education earned \$1,420. The DPE fact sheet also looked at wage disparities per occupational category and found that, without exception, women's wages lag far behind men. Despite comprising 55 percent of workers in professional and related occupations, women in those professions earn 28 percent less than men.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is aimed at closing the pay discrimination gap by strengthening the Equal Pay Act of 1963. This legislation will:

- Clarify acceptable reasons for differences in pay to ensure that a wage gap is legitimate and truly a result of factors other than gender;

- Allow for reasonable comparisons between employees to determine fair wages;

- Prohibit employer retaliation against workers who inquire about employee wages in general, or disclose their own wage;

- Provide women with the option to proceed in an opt-out class action lawsuit and allow women to receive punitive and compensatory damages for pay discrimination;

- Increase training for Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) staff to better identify and handle wage disputes;

- Require EEOC to develop regulations directing employers to collect wage data;

- Require the Department of Labor to reinstate activities that promote equal pay (i.e. educational programs, technical assistance to employers, promoting research about pay disparities between men and women); and,

- Establish salary negotiation skills training for women and girls.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a long overdue bill to help close the pay gap suffered by women workers. IFPTE urges you to support H.R. 7.

Sincerely,

PAUL SHEARON,
President.

MATTHEW BIGGS,
Secretary-Treasurer/
Legislative Director.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Chair, reporting this data allows the EEOC to see which employers have racial or gender pay gaps that differ significantly from the pay patterns of other employers in their industry and region.

To be clear, this pay data will not conclusively establish that any employer is violating the law, and it isn't intended to. What it will do is aggregate millions of data points to establish gender and racial pay patterns within job categories, industries, and localities, allowing identification of firms that significantly depart from those benchmarks that may warrant further analysis.

□ 1515

Simply put, we cannot end unfair pay discrimination if we don't have the data.

I join my colleague from North Carolina in celebrating a record number of

women entering the workforce, but let's compensate them fairly for their work, and let's use data to inform our decisions.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 12, add at the end the following: "Pay disparities are especially severe for women and girls of color."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, and I strongly support H.R. 7 and any effort to address the gender wage gap in this country.

A terrible disparity exists in our country. Women on average make 80 cents to every dollar made by their White male counterpart. What is worse is that it is not getting any better.

Last year, the gender wage gap actually grew for women of color. For every dollar made by their non-Hispanic White male counterpart, an African American woman makes 61 cents, a Native American woman makes 58 cents, and women who look like me, Latinas, make 53 cents on the dollar for similar work. That is less than the average woman in the 1960s.

Do I not work just as hard as my male counterparts? Do I deserve to make 53 cents on the dollar? And do I not have to support my family just as much as any man?

Because of the gender pay gap, Latinas lose an average of \$28,386. That amounts to more than \$1 million over her career.

To earn the same amount as her White non-Hispanic male colleagues, a Black woman must work until she is 86 years old. You cannot get those hours back, those years back, or those decades back.

The gender wage gap contributes to a wealth of disparity that makes it harder for people of color to get ahead.

In 2013, the median White household had about \$134,000 in total wealth. For the median Black household, it is \$11,000. That is a 13-to-1 ratio.

Addressing the gender wage gap is the first step to addressing larger

issues of pay parity among historically underserved groups.

My first amendment changes the findings section of the Paycheck Fairness Act to recognize the devastating impacts the wage gap has on women of color. We must acknowledge that the wage gap is not color blind. By failing to recognize the specific effect the wage gap has on women and girls of color, these impacts might go unnoticed.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, my colleague just said that Latina women are being paid 53 cents for every dollar a White man earns for the same work. That is currently illegal and should be reported.

My colleague may want to amend her statement on that, but I want to say again, paying a woman less than a man when they are both doing the same work is abhorrent and illegal.

Women deserve equal pay for equal work. That is why two Federal laws prohibit pay discrimination based on sex.

What Congress should be looking at are ways to expand opportunities for women in the workplace. H.R. 7, however, does nothing to help women. Instead, it is written to help trial lawyers.

Rather than treating sex discrimination charges with the seriousness they deserve, H.R. 7 is designed to make it easier for trial lawyers to bring more suits of questionable validity, which will siphon off money from settlements and jury awards to line the pockets of trial lawyers.

As we have said before, H.R. 7 offers no new or meaningful protections against pay discrimination.

The findings section in H.R. 7 to which this amendment is added already discusses women in the workplace and implies that the gender pay gap is largely caused by discriminatory acts. However, economic studies conducted by government and private entities alike consistently show that women make more holistic and discerning choices than men about managing work-life demands, placing an equal and sometimes higher value on life factors besides their paycheck as they make decisions about hours worked, overtime pursued, and promotions sought.

Those values and choices should be honored, Madam Chair. As such, the gender pay gap significantly shrinks when these choices and factors are taken into account.

Pay discrimination is a serious issue, but I do not believe this amendment will improve the bill or help to address pay discrimination in the workplace.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close.

Madam Chair, my amendment shines a light on the plight of women and girls of color and sets the tone to take their struggle into account throughout the rest of the bill.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle might have never heard about retaliation, about blacklisting. When women have the courage to come forward and report these wage thefts and abuses, they are treated differently under current law. That is why this bill is important. That is why this amendment is important.

Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for introducing this bill, for her dedication to fair pay.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, again I say, Republicans abhor any type of discrimination, particularly pay discrimination against women.

Madam Chair, if H.R. 7 would help with the situation that my colleague described, we would be in favor of it. No woman should be discriminated against because she reports the fact that she is receiving unequal pay for work, but, again, H.R. 7 does nothing to help those situations. That is why we oppose it.

Madam Chair, H.R. 7 is not helping women; it is helping trial lawyers. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 3, insert "with specific attention paid to women and girls from historically underrepresented and minority groups" after "disparities".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a second amendment to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

This amendment ensures that women and girls of color are included in the research, education, and outreach done by the Secretary of Labor.

The sad truth is that women, especially women of color, are still paid

less than their male counterparts for the same type of work. I know this because it happened to me.

One of my very first jobs was in a male-dominated industry, selling steel. It didn't matter that I performed as well, if not better, than my male colleagues. It didn't matter that I sold steel in three languages while they sold in just one. I would do my own data entry to get the job done, while they relied on an assistant. And when I needed to rush a shipment, I was not afraid to walk into the warehouse, pick the material, pack it, and send it to my customer. I was still paid less.

I had to leave that job that I loved because I wasn't getting my fair share. It was a shame then and it is a shame today.

On average, Latinas still get paid 53 cents to every dollar made by their White male colleagues for the same type of work.

Today, we can act to change this. By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act with my amendment, maybe young Latinas and other women of color will not have to suffer and share my experience.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, women deserve equal pay for equal work. In America, it is law codified in the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act.

Unfortunately, H.R. 7 is a false promise that creates opportunities and advantages for trial lawyers, not for working women, and the bill already requires new government studies.

□ 1530

H.R. 7 allows for undocumented compensatory and punitive damages, expands class actions, and makes it impossible to defend against a claim, when the pay difference at issue is legitimate. But the bill does not offer new protections for workers against pay discrimination.

Both government and nongovernment studies have shown that the gender pay gap significantly shrinks when certain choices and factors are included, such as choices made in managing work-life demands.

For example, a recent Harvard University study found that the gap in pay between female and male bus and train operators working for the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority was explained by the workplace choices that women and men make, rather than other factors such as discrimination. The Harvard study is noteworthy because the workplace characteristics of the female operators are entirely comparable to their male operators. All of the operators are represented by the same union, and all are covered by the same collective bargaining agreement.

We want to ensure the laws prohibiting pay discrimination are effective. However, this amendment, and the underlying provision in H.R. 7, are not going to be helpful in this regard.

We should strive to provide women and all workers more freedom, flexibility, and opportunities. I do not believe this amendment will help us achieve that goal.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, my amendment will expand the Paycheck Fairness Act to ensure the Secretary of Labor is paying attention to specific issues and researching the wage gap; educating employers, the media, and labor organizations on these findings, specifically highlighting the impact on underrepresented groups; ensuring minorities are included in informational and educational outreach programs; and celebrating the accomplishments of employers who are leading the way to specifically address the gender gap issue for women of color.

By paying specific attention to women of color in their research, maybe, one day, we can fill that gap to recognize that diversity of perspective can be an asset.

I wonder how different my experience would have been if the Paycheck Fairness Act would have been in place at the time. Would I still have become a homeowner? Maybe. Would I still have been a successful mother of three sons? Maybe. Would I have been able to afford to pay for childcare? Maybe. These are the things that women in business and the workforce are having to deal with every single day.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I want to say, again: no one in the workplace should be discriminated against. No woman of color, no woman, should be discriminated against. Republicans are opposed to any discrimination, in pay or otherwise, but H.R. 7 is not going to fix that. If it were, we would be on board.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amend section 3(a)(2) to read as follows:

(2) by striking "any other factor other than sex" and inserting "a bona fide business-related reason other than sex"; and

Page 6, strike lines 9 through 20.

Page 6, line 21, strike "(C)" and insert "(B)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Madam Chair, this amendment adds the language “a bona fide business-related reason” to make clear to the courts that the factor other than sex defense in the Equal Pay Act cannot be used as a loophole or excuse for using sex as a factor.

This amendment additionally strikes the remaining provisions of the underlying bill relating to applications of the factor other than sex defense.

These unnecessary provisions require that, even when an employer already shows the factor is other than sex, it must meet additional illogical and insurmountable burdens, effectively paving an unimpeded path to the promise of unlimited punitive and compensatory damages for trial lawyers.

In sum, this amendment strengthens current law and eliminates the new and untested concepts the underlying bill imposes on employers. It would make it impossible for an employer to defend any difference in pay, even when based on any number of legitimate job-related factors.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILD. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Byrne amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Madam Chair, don't be mistaken. This amendment is a clear attempt to undermine the fundamental objectives of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which are to engender pay disparity by, in part, further clarifying congressional intent so that courts can no longer dismiss meritorious claims.

The Paycheck Fairness Act fixes current employment discrimination and pay discrimination laws, laws that have proven insufficient, given that women still earn 80 cents on the dollar compared to similarly situated White men. And, of course, the disparity for women of color is even greater.

Under the current Equal Pay Act, an employer is not liable for gender pay disparity if the disparity is due to merit, seniority, quality of production or “a factor other than sex.” Some courts have interpreted the “factor other than sex” criteria so broadly that it frustrates the codified intent of the Equal Pay Act.

For instance, some courts have found that the “factor other than sex” need not be business related or even related to the particular job in question. Some courts have interpreted the “factor other than sex” defense to include “market forces,” or worse, accepted the argument that pay disparity can be explained by an employer's “random decision.”

Those interpretations are nothing more than a lifesaver for pretextual

discrimination. This amendment does the same thing.

My Republican colleagues' suggestion that the Paycheck Fairness Act eliminates the “factor other than sex” defense is contradicted by the text of this bill. An employer may still raise a “factor other than sex” defense provided that the “factor other than sex” be bona fide, job related, and required by business necessity.

This amendment's attempt to strike section (3)(a)(3), which explains what constitutes a bona fide factor, is an attempt to create ambiguity so that courts continue to interpret the act's protection in a narrow way.

This bill provides necessary clarity that this bona fide factor defense is only available when there is a real business necessity. This bill ensures that there is a connection between the pay disparity and the specific job in question. This amendment is contrary to the congressional intent of the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I was listening to the gentlewoman talk and I don't know that she has read my amendment, because my amendment actually solves the problem that she poses. There are some circuits that have given opinions just exactly as she said. What my amendment does is substitute for those decisions the bona fide business-related reason, which has been decided by a number of circuits. It is very clear. There is nothing amorphous about it. Practitioners in this area, like myself, understand exactly what it means. It actually solves the problem posed by the gentlewoman and makes it a lot better than what is in the underlying bill.

The problem with the underlying bill is that it injects amorphous new things that we don't have any idea what they would mean. What my amendment does is it actually makes it clear and solves the very problem that she stated in her presentation.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, this bill clarifies that the “factor other than sex” is only available on a bona fide job-related and business necessary reason.

It clarifies that this defense is not available where the employee demonstrates that a reasonable alternative employment practice would serve the same business purpose without producing a pay disparity and that the employer refused to adopt such an alternative practice.

Carefully consider those words. This is a burden-shifting provision that would simply allow an employee to show a reasonable alternative. It adds nothing to an employer's existing burden. It only allows an employee to rebut that defense with evidence.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentlewoman had to say. I was listening very carefully to her. I think she does have it confused, however, because it does inject an additional burden for employers that is not in the law right now and it does provide a ton of unclarity with regard to what they are going to have to do to comply with it. And I think my use of the bona fide business-related reason is going to inject the clarity we need and actually protect plaintiffs more than what is in the bill.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, given that we are having a discussion here over who understands the text of the bill, to read it directly into the RECORD.

“The bona fide factor defense, described in subparagraph (A)(iv) shall apply only if the employer demonstrates that such factor (i) is not based upon or derived from a sex-based differential in compensation; (ii) is job related with respect to the position in question; (iii) is consistent with business necessity; and, (iv) accounts for the entire differential in compensation at issue.”

It is very clearly set forth in the text.

Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, continue to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the Byrne amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentlewoman. I don't think she understands what that language actually means, how it has actually been interpreted by the courts, and how it may be totally misinterpreted against plaintiffs in these types of lawsuits.

What my amendment does is actually strengthen the hand of parties that have a clear understanding of what they are trying to accomplish there, either the plaintiffs or the defendants. It is an improvement in the bill for plaintiffs and defendants. We should all be for this, not against it. I don't want to go tit for tat with her on everything, but I do think she misunderstands both the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is my colleague from Alabama who is confused about the wording of this text. His amendment would specifically eliminate the wording that I just read into the RECORD.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas). The gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, once again, I heard what she read into the RECORD. I already read that. I understand exactly what it says. I think maybe I haven't made myself clear:

The underlying bill injects clarity into the law, which hurts plaintiffs in their cases. This will hurt women in bringing their cases. It will take years to try to get clarity through the court system, if we ever get clarity. That hurts plaintiffs in these lawsuits.

Defendants like to throw up unclarity. So I guess, perhaps, if you wanted to argue from that point of view, let's have a confusing bill. I am going to get clarity into the bill that actually helps women. And it is the irony of this whole proceeding that the bill that is supposed to help women, that they say is going to help women, hurts them. I am trying to help women with my amendment.

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

□ 1545

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates clarity. It simply replaces it with the words “bona fide,” with no additional definition or guidance, thereby ensuring that this defense will continue to be misunderstood, misused, and incorrectly applied by the courts.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this language is consistent with how nearly all circuit courts of appeal have interpreted this factor.

“Bona fide business-related reason” is not an empty phrase. For example, in one case where the employer alleged that the difference in pay was based on the higher paid person's participation in a bona fide skills development program, the court carefully examined the program to determine whether it was legitimate and, in fact, found that it was not.

This amendment helps women. If you want to help women in the workforce, this amendment does it. Their bill doesn't.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116–19.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for Congresswoman WATERS to offer her amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 23, insert after “women” the following: “(including women who are Asian American, Black or African-American, Hispanic American or Latino, Native American or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and White American)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, what a moment of tremendous pride it is to be here in the 116th Congress under a Democratic majority as we finally pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I rise in strong support of this bill, and I thank Chairman SCOTT for his tremendous leadership in shepherding this bill to the floor.

I also thank the author of H.R. 7, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, who has been a champion for women's rights her entire career. The Paycheck Fairness Act is a testament to her tireless dedication to the eradication of the gender pay gap, and it is by her leadership that we are here today on the verge of obtaining a more equitable workforce.

I also thank Congresswoman WATERS, who has long advocated for and fought for pay equity and been a beacon of courage for women across this country.

We passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963, which made it illegal to discriminate based on sex when men and women are performing jobs that require substantially equal effort, skill, and responsibility. We followed that up with title 7 of the Civil Rights Act, which, among other things, made it illegal to discriminate based on sex. And then 10 years ago, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Act, which made it clear that every single inadequate paycheck a woman receives is a new act of discrimination. And yet, inequality persisted.

Today, women are paid, on average, only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, resulting in a gap of \$10,169 per woman, per year. And that pay gap doesn't discriminate. It exists in all occupations, locales, and regardless of education or work history.

The Paycheck Fairness Act seeks to eliminate this gap by picking up where the Equal Pay Act of 1963 left off and strengthening protections for women in the workplace against retaliation, discriminatory screening, and legal obstacles to justice. This amendment to H.R. 7 will ensure that the data collected on behalf of the legislation will be inclusive of all races and ethnicities.

Pursuant to section 6 of H.R. 7, the Secretary of Labor must conduct studies as well as provide information to employers and the general public concerning the means by which gender pay disparities can be eliminated. These studies are a critical step forward towards closing the pay gap.

This amendment would clarify that these Department of Labor studies mandated by section 6 of the underlying bill must include not just information regarding pay disparities between men and women generally, but specifically for women of every racial and ethnic background.

Mr. Chairman, in order to empower all women, we must continue to highlight the specific barriers faced by and

the needs of women of color in the workforce.

In 2017, the gender wage gap widened for women of color. While research found that women made 80 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men, women of color fared much worse than average: Black women were paid only 61 cents for every dollar paid to White men; Native American women were paid 58 cents; and Latina women were paid only 53 cents.

That means that this year, Equal Pay Day, the date that marks how long women have to work into the year to earn what their White male counterparts earned in the previous calendar year, falls on April 2. But for Black women, Equal Pay Day isn't until August 22. Native American women's Equal Pay Day falls on September 23, and Latinas have to work nearly 11 full months into 2019 before they will see their Equal Pay Day on November 20. That is true economic injustice.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, once again, it is wrong to discriminate, including with respect to pay, based on sex. It is also illegal to do so under both the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike, supports equal pay for equal work because, when workers thrive, America thrives, but H.R. 7 does not further this goal.

Democrats claim H.R. 7 will improve upon these existing and bipartisan laws to create new avenues for women to fight pay discrimination. What H.R. 7 actually does is create new avenues for trial lawyers to earn higher paychecks—while dragging countless women into unwanted lawsuits.

Of the 2.8 million jobs created in the past year, more than 58 percent have gone to women.

Today, there are 74.9 million working women in the United States, more than ever before; and one in five employer businesses, nationwide, is owned by women.

We celebrate workers who choose to give priority to professional success and promotion, but it is equally important to show that we value freedom and diversity of choice in the workplace.

It is not the job of Federal lawmakers to tell American workers of either sex what their priorities should be. A number of economic studies conducted by government and private entities alike consistently show that women make more holistic and discerning choices than men about managing work-life demands.

The new government studies mandated by H.R. 7 will likely tell us what we already know and that our colleagues will not acknowledge: that

work patterns and life decisions are key to explaining the wage gap, and that the wage gap shrinks considerably when factors such as hours worked per week, industry, occupation, work experience, job tenure, and preferences for nonwage benefits are considered.

In addition to opening countless avenues for trial lawyer payouts while limiting employer defenses, H.R. 7 mandates intrusive and elaborate data collection from employers, breaking down compensation, hiring, termination, and promotion data by sex, race, and national origin of employees—that will cost about \$700 million a year.

Rather than expending taxpayer dollars on expanding studies, Federal lawmakers should promote a continued focus on strong economic policy, education, and innovation that will create opportunities and expand options for all American workers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, better information allows us to develop better policy solutions, and that is all this amendment does: collects more information to address an unacceptable inequality. By mandating that the studies conducted by the Department of Labor explicitly address and include women of color in particular, we can ensure that no one is left behind.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the gathering of this valuable information and vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a long road to get here, but today, women across the country of every race and ethnicity can stand tall and know that we value their work equally.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we believe women should not be discriminated against. We don't want women discriminated against, women of any category in this country, and this amendment is not necessary and neither is H.R. 7.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment and “no” on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that the amendment No. 6 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116–19.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subsection (f) of section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–8), as pro-

posed to be added by section 8, add at the end the following:

“(3) The compensation data under paragraph (1) shall be collected from each employer that—

“(A) is a private employer that has 100 or more employees, including such an employer that is a contractor with the Federal Government, or a subcontractor at any tier thereof; or

“(B) the Commission determines appropriate.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as a small business owner and employer, I understand the value of data because you can't improve what you don't measure. So my amendment, which I offer with Representative ILHAN OMAR, exempts employers with fewer than 100 employees from reporting compensation data and only requires those with more than 100 to do so.

Employers already report workforce data by race, sex, and ethnicity across 10 different job categories in their annual EEO–1 submission to the EEOC. So collecting this data simply ensures equal pay for equal work. If employers value the standard, this is an easy start.

I am very grateful to Chairman SCOTT and the leadership on the amendments to strengthen pay data collection and to Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO for her years and years of effort on this.

Persistent pay gaps exist in the U.S. workforce to correlate with sex, race, and ethnicity. The Congress has found that 64.6 percent of the wage gap can be explained by three factors: experience, industry, and occupation, the things my good friend from North Carolina pointed out. But the remaining 35 percent can't be explained by these differences.

Federal law specifically prohibits men and women from being paid differently for work, but enforcement of this mandate is impeded by a lack of knowledge—no data, not reliable data, especially data by sex and by race. This is a barrier to closing the persistent pay gap for women and minorities.

All we are really asking here is to be able to provide the data so that business leaders can make the good decisions and so that employees can discover if they are being unfairly paid. They have a right, then, to ask.

For over 50 years, companies have used the EEO–1 form to report. Earlier today, we have heard that this will represent an unfair burden on businesses.

While virtually every business I know—even those with two, three, and four employees—find ways to outsource paycheck preparation, almost all of this has been digitized. But to be extra cautious and make sure that we are

not providing any burden on small business, this amendment would exempt those with 100 employees or less.

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

□ 1600

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I reserve the right to change my mind based on what I hear from my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. Chair, I do have great respect for my colleague from Virginia, and I appreciate the fact that this amendment recognizes the very serious problem with H.R. 7 by applying the expansive government data collection mandate only to business owners with 100 or more employees. However, the forced data collection scheme in the underlying bill, even with this amendment, is still extremely misguided.

H.R. 7 requires business owners to, for the first time ever, submit reams of pay data to the EEOC, broken down by job category, race, sex, and ethnicity. Moreover, the collection must also include hiring, termination, and promotion data, which even the Obama administration's 2016 pay data collection scheme did not include.

This data collection mandate raises several concerns.

First, it puts at risk volumes of highly confidential pay data involving millions of individual workers. We all know the widespread data breaches the Federal Government has suffered.

Second, the EEOC will not be able to manage or properly use this data. It has never been explained what exactly the EEOC will do with this data.

Third, this mandate is overly burdensome. The data cells required from business owners when they file an employer information report, EEO–1, with the EEOC will expand from 180 cells to 3,660. It has been estimated that the new reams of pay data added to the EEO–1 will cost business owners \$700 million annually.

Although this amendment would spare some business owners from the mandate, the serious flaws in this data collection mandate make the provision in the underlying bill not worth saving.

If the pay data collection mandate is not worth applying to smaller firms, then perhaps it should be reconsidered entirely. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to speak during general debate, but I will take this time to speak on behalf of this legislation and also to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the American people entrusted Democrats with the majority in part because we pledged to work hard on the issues they care about most, issues affecting their everyday lives.

I am the father of three daughters. They are all extraordinary people. I want them all treated based upon the content of their character, their performance, and the duties that they perform, not on the fact that they happen to be daughters and not sons.

One of the issues we pledged to address was raising wages, and that includes addressing the gender pay gap, which keeps women from earning their fair share and hurts families, children, and all people.

The last time I was the majority leader, which was from 2007 to 2011, we enacted the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to make it easier for women who have faced discriminatory pay and benefits to seek justice.

Lilly Ledbetter had worked hard, and she did not know that she was being paid less than her counterparts doing exactly the same thing she was doing, with exactly the same responsibility and exactly the same expectations. There was no justice in that, but she didn't know it. The Supreme Court said, well, you didn't raise the issue quickly enough.

We also passed the Paycheck Fairness Act in that same Congress, but, unfortunately, the Senate failed to enact it as well.

Now we return to this important work of ensuring equal pay for equal work. Who, intellectually, can oppose that concept? Who, with any sense of fairness and fair play, could oppose that concept and precept?

It is shameful, Mr. Chairman, that, in 2019, 56 years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, we are here fighting for equal pay. A half century later, women still earn, on average, 80 cents to a man's dollar, and, very frankly, minority women earn less than that. That gap is even worse for minorities. Two-thirds of women are now either the primary breadwinners or co-breadwinners in their households.

Make no mistake, this is an economic concern for families across our country. This is not a woman's issue. It is a fairness issue. It is an every family, every person issue.

Democrats ran on a platform of raising wages, as I said. We are focused on making sure that more working families can make it in America. That is what this bill will help achieve.

I am proud that every member of the Democratic Caucus—let me repeat that, every member—234 members of the Democratic Caucus have signed on as cosponsors of this bill because we believe it is fair; because we believe it is right; because we believe it is good for families; and, yes, because we believe it is good for the American economy.

ROSA DELAURO is on the floor, and I want to thank the gentlewoman. We

hear the phrase, "Keep the faith." ROSA DELAURO has kept the faith year after year, not only with women of America, but with the families and children of America who rely on women's wages for the quality of their lives, and their partners', and their spouses'.

I thank the gentlewoman, ROSA DELAURO, for all that she has done for our country in keeping the faith.

I also thank my dear friend and my colleague from my neighboring State of Virginia, Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, for his faithfulness, for his focus, and for his bringing this bill to the floor so early in our session.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to observe April 2, which is Equal Pay Day. It is a day symbolizing how far into the year women must work to earn what men earned in the previous year—essentially, 3 months of free labor. Not in this body, because we are all paid the same in this body. We comply with this bill. That is the good news.

The bad news is, women, on average, have to work not 12 months but 15 months to earn what men earn in 12 months. That is what that language meant.

I urge my colleagues to vote today to make this the last Equal Pay Day and pass this bill to ensure the promise of economic equality for all.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all—drop the "men"—that all are created equal. That view maybe self-evident, but it is not self-executing. Let us act upon it today.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time I have remaining, and how much time the gentleman from Virginia has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have said it I don't know how many times today. I will say it one more time. Republicans are opposed to pay discrimination. We have always been opposed to pay discrimination. We have always been for the rights of others.

The first Republican President in this country was the leader that ended slavery in this country. Republicans have been for civil rights. We have been for equal pay. We support the rights of all citizens to be treated equally. We have all said that, every Republican who has spoken here.

This bill does not do that. I believe that the gentleman from Virginia's amendment proves that this is a damaging bill, because he wants to spare smaller companies from the very damaging impacts of the pay data collection mandate.

That, in a way, is discriminatory in itself because there is a feeling that it is okay for big businesses to pay the cost of this, but it is not okay for small businesses to pay the cost of this. In a

way, this amendment itself damns the bill.

As our colleague from Maryland says, I hope that every business owner in America will note that every Democrat is a cosponsor of this bill. I hope that word gets out loud and clear across the country, particularly among business owners.

I will say that this amendment to spare smaller companies makes the teeniest, tiniest improvement to this bill, and, therefore, I will support it, although I don't believe the bill will go anywhere in the Senate.

It is my hope that, again, that points out the discriminatory nature and the terrible aspects of this bill to all business and industry in the country. It doesn't help the underlying bill in terms of the other businesses and industries.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina for supporting this amendment, and I thank my friend from North Carolina for clearly stating a number of times today that Democrats and Republicans are both committed to equal pay for men and for women.

I think our differences just come down to how we accomplish that, because 50 years after the Equal Pay Act was signed, there are still significant differences, despite our joint commitment to equal pay.

If unequal pay continues to persist, how do we address it? We simply say that the collection of data to the EEO-1 is the best way to move forward. The employers with less than 100 have been exempted from the very beginning of the EEO-1 report, so this is simply consistent with that and recognizes that, to get meaningful data, sometimes you need more than a handful of people. That is, 6 or 10 or 12 people don't necessarily give you an apples-to-apples comparison. When you get more than 100, you can do it.

The government already collects the sensitive data. It has done it for years without privacy concerns. My friend pointed out there may be 3,200 or 3,600 categories. Right now, with deep learning and machine learning, this is something that takes a microsecond to do. This is very easy. We are now in an intellectual and digital world where we can have the EEO discover which companies have persistent patterns of pay inequity, and it really works.

All our offices have pay transparency. When I am trying to figure out how much to pay a legislative correspondent or legislative director or front office, I know that everyone can go online and figure out what everyone else is making. That is a powerful incentive for us to make sure that people are paid fairly and paid equally. All we are trying to do is bring the same transparency to American businesses across the country.

Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for her support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 6, strike “Not later than” and insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”.

In section 6, add at the end the following:

(b) REPORT ON GENDER PAY GAP IN TEENAGE LABOR FORCE.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Director of the Women’s Bureau and in coordination with the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, shall—

(A) submit to Congress a report on the gender pay gap in the teenage labor force; and

(B) make the report available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Labor.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(A) An examination of trends and potential solutions relating to the teenage gender pay gap.

(B) An examination of how the teenage gender pay gap potentially translates into greater wage gaps in the overall labor force.

(C) An examination of overall lifetime earnings and losses for informal and formal jobs for women, including women of color.

(D) An examination of the teenage gender pay gap, including a comparison of the average amount earned by males and females, respectively, in informal jobs, such as babysitting and other freelance jobs, as well as formal jobs, such as retail, restaurant, and customer service.

(E) A comparison of—

(i) the types of tasks typically performed by women from the teenage years through adulthood within certain informal jobs, such as babysitting and other freelance jobs, and formal jobs, such as retail, restaurant, and customer service; and

(ii) the types of tasks performed by younger males in such positions.

(F) Interviews and surveys with workers and employers relating to early gender-based pay discrepancies.

(G) Recommendations for—

(i) addressing pay inequality for women from the teenage years through adulthood, including such women of color;

(ii) addressing any disadvantages experienced by young women with respect to work experience and professional development;

(iii) the development of standards and best practices for workers and employees to ensure better pay for young women and the prevention of early inequalities in the workplace; and

(iv) expanding awareness for teenage girls on pay rates and employment rights in order

to reduce greater inequalities in the overall labor force.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank Representative ROSA DELAUNO for her hard work on H.R. 7, the Pay-check Fairness Act. This longstanding legislation which would ensure equal pay for equal work has been introduced in every single Congress since 1997.

As the chair of the Bipartisan Women’s Caucus, I am proud to support H.R. 7, meaningful legislation that would at a minimum ensure that workers are protected against gender-based pay discrimination, prevent retaliation against those who voluntarily discuss wages, eliminate loopholes which would allow institutional discrimination in pay; equalize remedies for gender-based discrimination; and prohibit salary history from dictating future pay.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. While we debate the gender pay gap in the professional workplace, it is imperative that we understand how and when the pay gap begins. For women, the gender-based wage gap typically emerges in the teenage years and only increases with time. My amendment will require the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Labor Statistics to submit a report to Congress that studies the teenage pay gap and provide recommendations to address it.

A 2018 study cited in The Washington Post reported that the gender-based wage gap emerges well before adulthood, leading to long-term effects on lifetime earnings and economic mobility. The economic impacts of the gender-based wage gap are even greater for women of color.

Teenagers are a substantial but often understudied part of our workforce. Many teenagers, not out of just wanting something to do, but out of necessity or because of their financial situation, work part-time while in school and sometimes enter the workforce, unfortunately, as early as 12 years old. To truly address the wage gap, we need to have a better way to identify the root of these gaps.

This report would provide the statistics necessary to uncover why this pay gap exists and the best ways to remedy the inconsistency. If women are raised in a culture where they believe they are not equal to men, the disparity that exists will never be broken. We must work to end that mindset now.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in America, discriminating in pay based on sex is illegal as codified in the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act.

Democrats claim H.R. 7 will improve upon these bipartisan laws to create new opportunities for women to fight pay discrimination. What H.R. 7 actually does is create new opportunities for trial lawyers to earn higher paychecks. Similarly, while this amendment appears to be marketed as assisting young women, this paternalistic approach undermines young women’s abilities and pigeonholes them into stereotypical roles.

This amendment directs the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study on the gender pay gap in the teenage labor force and then to report recommendations to Congress, including recommendations to expand awareness, specifically for teenage girls, on pay grades and employment rights. I am tempted to call this the babysitting amendment because it additionally asks the Department of Labor to spend taxpayer dollars to compare amounts earned by men and women in informal jobs such as babysitting.

This amendment could also be called the in loco parentis amendment, because it is parents who should be teaching their children about the benefits of hard work and education and the importance of a first job, which is often a minimum wage job. We don’t need the government coming in and telling children and parents what their children should be doing. These initial jobs help to teach teenagers important skills that will stay with them their entire lives.

American women of all ages are skilled, they are smart, and today they are driving the American economy. Of the 2.8 million jobs created in the last year, more than 58 percent have gone to women. One in five employer businesses is owned by women; and we are seeing more young women than men earning college degrees.

I support equal pay for equal work, which is rightfully required under two Federal statutes. Congress should focus on policies that will continue to increase economic opportunity and expand options for all workers. This amendment and the underlying bill fails in this regard.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I would really feel challenged to think that my colleague is unaware that there are young girls who are teenagers who work in restaurants and in other capacities, not because their parents want them to have activities but because they are literally trying to survive and feed themselves and sometimes their brothers and sisters, and to say that it is not necessary for us to have data and not just stand at a mike as an elected official and make assumptions based on your own privilege of life.

I think it is imperative that we look at the data, and here I am saying that—before I can say and validate the status of teenage girls—I would want statistics and reports so that we can truly address the inequality that girls often get, and the mindset that a little boy who is out working, he needs the pay and often is given a larger amount of money versus a girl—and every girl is not a babysitter, but if we want to call this the babysitter amendment, I will accept it.

As we work to address the pay gap, it is important that we do not forget our new generation of leaders, and it is about breaking a cycle, about having a young girl who is working, and she understands that I have value and that I too should be paid an equal pay.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I know that my colleague was not on the floor earlier when I spoke and told of my need to work even before I was a teenager, and I worked for survival. So I know that she did not know that and did not know that I do not take lightly the fact that many young people in this country are like I was and working to help support their families so that they have food and they are able to survive.

I do not take lightly anyone's work in this country, not anyone. I worked hard all my life, and I have always wanted to be paid equally with men, and I know there were times I was not. So I understand that. I never want to see anyone discriminated against in this country. I particularly never want to see a woman discriminated against for equal pay when she is doing the job that a man is doing.

I wish with all my heart that we were improving on the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act and helping to make things better for women with H.R. 7. We are not. We are lining the pockets of trial lawyers and in many cases will be harming women. This amendment stereotypes young women because it mentions babysitting. That is where the stereotypes come in, in this amendment, and that is unfortunate.

We do have a younger generation, and we have women who can do any job that any man can do, and she should be paid equally for it. But neither this study nor this bill is going to guarantee that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116–19.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 23, insert after “employee” the following: “(such as by inquiring or discussing with the employer why the wages of the employee are set at a certain rate or salary)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start by saying it is a privilege to be able to stand on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in this year, in this term, and in this session of Congress to participate in the debate and the discussion and to offer an amendment on this historic bill, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I would like to first thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of the committee, BOBBY SCOTT from Virginia, for his leadership on this issue and this bill. I want to recognize the decades' long work of my colleague from Connecticut, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, on the underlying bill and her efforts, along with many other women, including Maryland's former Senator Barbara Mikulski to finally ensure that women are paid and treated fairly in the workplace.

My amendment would enhance pay transparency protections in this bill. This amendment would make it unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an employee for simply discussing or inquiring why they are being paid a certain wage or salary.

Mr. Chairman, if you found out that you were being paid less than your colleagues for the same work, you would probably demand to be paid more. But for too long, it has been considered taboo to discuss your salary with your coworkers let alone confront your boss if you were being paid unfairly.

When pay is transparent, organizations must be able to justify each employee's salary, thus reducing or eliminating any type of bias.

That is why the Paycheck Fairness Act puts transparency front and center and why my amendment goes a little further and gives every employee the right to negotiate the higher pay.

Since Congress has not been able to act over the past several years, States have led the way in promoting pay transparency, including California, Illinois, Louisiana, and my State of Maryland. In Maryland we added very broad pay transparency protections to ensure employees the ability to discover and discuss disparities in pay, and we even expanded prohibitions against discriminatory pay practices to include gender identity, an item that I would hope that this Congress may take up later this session.

But my amendment today reiterates the importance of transparency in the

workplace. Every employee should be able to advocate and negotiate for themselves without fear of reprisal. According to the Carnegie Mellon study, men are four times more likely than women to ask for a raise, and when women do ask, they typically request 30 percent less than men do.

We should be encouraging employees, regardless of their gender, to inquire and discuss disparities in pay with their employers and advocate for themselves if they aren't being paid fairly or if it is simply time they received a well-deserved raise.

□ 1630

Mr. Chairman, at a time when wages are not rising fast enough, Congress must ensure every working American is paid equally and fairly and is empowered throughout their salary negotiation process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Pay discrimination on the basis of sex is wrong, and it also, importantly, violates two Federal statutes.

Retaliation by an employer against an employee for pursuing reasonable discussion or inquiry regarding potentially discriminating compensation is wrong, and it, too, is illegal.

However, like the rest of this bill, the expanded nonretaliation provision in H.R. 7 goes too far, and this amendment takes it even further.

Under current law, those who inquire about, discuss, or disclose compensation information in a reasonable manner and with a good faith belief that an unlawful pay disparity may exist are protected from retaliation. However, the underlying provision in H.R. 7 regarding pay disclosures and discussion has no limits at all.

The inquiry, discussion, and disclosure allowed under this bill is not required to be reasonable nor related to any perceived pay disparity and raises serious privacy concerns for all employees, especially in the age of social media.

H.R. 7 takes away an employee's ability to control disclosure of information about their own pay. It also limits an employer's ability to protect what should be confidential information about employees.

Congress should focus on policies that promote opportunity and options for all workers. This amendment does not further this purpose.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to protect workers' privacy rights by opposing this amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, historically, the cloak of confidentiality has often been the shield used by employers to discriminate against women when it comes to paycheck fairness.

I encourage all my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, once again, I reiterate my opposition to the underlying bill and to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-19 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 24, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

AYES—406

Abraham	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Adams	Chabot	F.
Aderholt	Cheney	Duffy
Aguiar	Chu, Judy	Duncan
Allred	Cicilline	Dunn
Amash	Cisneros	Emmer
Armstrong	Clark (MA)	Engel
Arrington	Clarke (NY)	Escobar
Axne	Clay	Eshoo
Bacon	Cleaver	Españolat
Baird	Cline	Estes
Balderson	Cloud	Evans
Banks	Clyburn	Finkenauer
Barr	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Barragán	Cole	Fleischmann
Bass	Collins (GA)	Fletcher
Beatty	Collins (NY)	Flores
Bera	Comer	Fortenberry
Bergman	Conaway	Foster
Beyer	Connolly	Fox (NC)
Bilirakis	Cook	Frankel
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (UT)	Correa	Fulcher
Blumenauer	Costa	Gabbard
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Gaetz
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Gallagher
Bost	Craig	Galleo
Boyle, Brendan	Crenshaw	Garamendi
F.	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Brady	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Brindisi	Cuellar	Gianforte
Brooks (AL)	Cummings	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Cunningham	Gohmert
Brown (MD)	Curtis	Golden
Brownley (CA)	Davids (KS)	Gomez
Buchanan	Davidson (OH)	Gonzalez (OH)
Buck	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Bucshon	Davis, Danny K.	González-Colón
Budd	Davis, Rodney	(PR)
Burgess	Dean	Gooden
Bustos	DeFazio	Gothelmer
Butterfield	DeGette	Graves (LA)
Byrne	DeLauro	Graves (MO)
Calvert	DelBene	Green (TN)
Carbajal	Delgado	Green (TX)
Cárdenas	Demings	Griffith
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Grijalva
Carter (GA)	Deutch	Grothman
Cartwright	Diaz-Balart	Guest
Case	Dingell	Guthrie
Casten (IL)	Doggett	Haaland
Castor (FL)		Hagedorn

Harder (CA)	Marchant	Schiff
Harris	Marshall	Schneider
Hartzler	Massie	Schrader
Hastings	Mast	Schrier
Hayes	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Heck	McAdams	Scott, Austin
Herrera Beutler	McBath	Scott, David
Hice (GA)	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Higgins (LA)	McCaul	Serrano
Higgins (NY)	McClintock	Sewell (AL)
Hill (AR)	McCollum	Shalala
Hill (CA)	McEachin	Sherman
Himes	McGovern	Sherrill
Holding	McHenry	Shimkus
Hollingsworth	McKinley	Simpson
Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney	Sires
Horsford	Meadows	Slotkin
Houlihan	Meeks	Smith (MO)
Hoyer	Meng	Smith (NE)
Hudson	Meuser	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	Miller	Smith (WA)
Huizenga	Mitchell	Smucker
Hunter	Moolenaar	Soto
Hurd (TX)	Moore	Spanberger
Jackson Lee	Morelle	Spano
Jayapal	Moulton	Speier
Jeffries	Mucarsel-Powell	Stanton
Johnson (GA)	Mullin	Staubert
Johnson (LA)	Murphy	Stefanik
Johnson (OH)	Nadler	Steil
Johnson (SD)	Napolitano	Steube
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Stevens
Jordan	Neguse	Stewart
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Stivers
Joyce (PA)	Norcross	Suozzi
Kaptur	Norton	Swalwell (CA)
Katko	Nunes	Takano
Keating	O'Halleran	Taylor
Kelly (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (MS)	Olson	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (PA)	Omar	Thompson (PA)
Kennedy	Palazzo	Thornberry
Khanna	Pallone	Timmons
Kildee	Panetta	Tipton
Kilmer	Pappas	Titus
Kim	Pascarella	Tlaib
Kind	Payne	Tonko
King (NY)	Pence	Torres (CA)
Kinziger	Perlmutter	Torres Small
Kirkpatrick	Perry	(NM)
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Trahan
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	Trone
Kustoff (TN)	Phillips	Turner
LaHood	Pingree	Underwood
LaMalfa	Pocan	Upton
Lamb	Porter	Van Drew
Lamborn	Posey	Vargas
Langevin	Pressley	Veasey
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Vela
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Velázquez
Latta	Raskin	Visclosky
Lawrence	Reed	Wagner
Lawson (FL)	Reschenthaler	Walberg
Lee (CA)	Rice (NY)	Walden
Lee (NV)	Richmond	Walorski
Lesko	Roby	Waltz
Levin (CA)	Rodgers (WA)	Wasserman
Levin (MI)	Roe, David P.	Schultz
Lewis	Rogers (AL)	Watkins
Lieu, Ted	Rogers (KY)	Watson Coleman
Lipinski	Rooney (FL)	Weber (TX)
Loeb sack	Rose (NY)	Webster (FL)
Lofgren	Rose, John W.	Welch
Long	Rouda	Westerman
Loudermilk	Roybal-Allard	Wexton
Lowenthal	Ruiz	Wild
Lowe y	Ruppersberger	Williams
Lucas	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Womack
Lujan	Ryan	Woodall
Luria	Sablan	Wright
Lynch	Sánchez	Yarmuth
Malinowski	Sarbanes	Yoho
Maloney,	Scalise	Young
Carolyn B.	Scanlon	Zeldin
Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	

NOES—24

Allen	Gosar	Rice (SC)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Riggleman
Babin	Hern, Kevin	Rouzer
Biggs	King (IA)	Roy
Burchett	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Norman	Walker
Crawford	Palmer	Waters
Ferguson	Ratcliffe	Wenstrup

NOT VOTING—7

DesJarlais	Radewagen	Wittman
Granger	San Nicolas	
Plaskett	Wilson (SC)	

□ 1702

Messrs. SCHWEIKERT, MOONEY of West Virginia, FERGUSON, RIGGLEMAN, and PALMER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. COLE, BUCSHON, GIBBS, BISHOP of Utah, GAETZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, WEBER of Texas, LAMBORN, and CLOUD changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “YEA” on rollcall No. 132.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 252, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, in its present form, I am.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Foxx of North Carolina moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

In section 3(c)(5)—

(1) strike “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) insert after subparagraph (A), the following:

(B) by inserting after “defendant” the following: “(except that any contingent attorney’s fees shall not exceed 49 percent of any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs);” and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am here to offer a motion to recommit that is about honesty.

It is about making sure this bill does what my Democrat colleagues say it will do, and that is help victims of wage discrimination on the basis of sex.

It is about making sure that any woman who experiences unfair and illegal wage discrimination just because she is a woman doesn’t go through all the hardship of a legal battle only to see her lawyer walk away with even more of her money.

With this motion to recommit, if a plaintiff has entered into a contingency fee arrangement in Equal Pay Act litigation, the attorney’s contingency fee, including costs, will not exceed 49 percent of the judgment awarded to the plaintiff.

If adopted, it will ensure that the individual who has brought the claim actually receives a majority of the judgment and that the attorney doesn’t collect the lion’s share.

The authors of H.R. 7 failed to include in the text any new legal protections for workers against discrimination. Instead, the bill alters the Equal Pay Act to allow unlimited compensatory damages even when there is no intentional discrimination, and unlimited punitive damages. It also expands class action lawsuits.

H.R. 7 makes it impossible in many cases for employers to defend against Equal Pay Act claims even when there is a legitimate business reason for a pay differential.

H.R. 7 creates special incentives and awards for trial lawyers.

For working women who have been taken advantage of by their bosses, it sets them up to lose out again.

H.R. 7 encourages trial lawyers to file more lawsuits of questionable validity and to drive workers into the suits without their knowledge for the purpose of siphoning off the new pool of unlimited compensatory and punitive damages created by H.R. 7, lining their own pockets at the expense of plaintiffs.

A similar amendment capping lawyers’ contingency fees at 15 percent was offered by Mr. BYRNE when H.R. 7

was considered in committee. Every Democrat on the Education and Labor Committee opposed this modest change.

If this amendment is adopted, trial lawyers will have to somehow make due with 49 percent of the overall judgment, and we all know that trial lawyers siphon off more than this amount in many of their class action cases.

Victims of true pay discrimination should be the true beneficiaries of any judgment in their favor. This amendment will help ensure this outcome in Equal Pay Act cases.

Madam Speaker, supporters of H.R. 7 say the bill is about helping victims of pay discrimination. If that is true, then all Members should support this reasonable proposal.

All we are asking is that if our colleagues are so intent on giving trial lawyers a bigger piece of the pie, then consider giving working women more than a few crumbs.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I am opposed to all caps on attorney’s fees in this type of case.

The only criteria for the amount of attorney’s fees charged should be reasonableness in the context of the case itself.

I have spent more than 30 years in courtrooms, most of that time representing the defense in civil matters, almost always for companies; in other words, against the very trial lawyers we speak of.

So I have no bias in favor of those lawyers, but let me tell you this: representing plaintiffs in employment cases is a very hard job. These lawyers work for every penny they earn. They take cases that put their own livelihood at risk.

Many employment cases take years to resolve. Often they have to go to court over and over to litigate discovery and pretrial matters, and all the while, they are not collecting a paycheck from that case, because they have taken it on a contingent fee basis.

Without an award at the end of the case, they receive nothing, and they advance out-of-pocket expenses.

But even more important, without these lawyers, low-income female employees with legitimate grievances would have no recourse. Only with a competent lawyer’s help can they proceed.

This motion, if passed, would discourage lawyers from taking these cases. And if they don’t take these cases, employees, workers, families lose out.

The only test for attorney’s fees should be reasonableness. Courts and judges are well equipped to determine whether a fee is reasonable, far better equipped than Congress is.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

□ 1715

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

There are few things that define us as a country more distinctly than the idea of the American Dream: the idea that anyone can make it here through hard work and dedication. That dream rests on giving people a fair shot.

Right now, too many people in this country just aren’t getting a fair shot, and women in this country face additional barriers because they simply are not paid equally for their work.

Madam Speaker, this bill, H.R. 7, supports paycheck fairness because equal pay for equal work is about respect, and in New Jersey we know respect. I know what paycheck fairness looks like because we just passed it in New Jersey. It is high time that Congress ensures these commonsense values for the rest of the women across this country.

I have listened to objections raised today that women already have protections for equal pay. Well, let me assure you that the protections in our laws are not adequate.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, for women who are earning just 80 cents on every dollar. I rise for our African American women who are only earning 61 cents on the dollar. I rise today for Hispanic women who are only earning 53 cents on the dollar.

Madam Speaker, I rise today for American women and for their families so we can give them a fair shot, like a woman in my district who, despite being a single mom helping to pay off her children’s college debt, was passed over for a raise because her male coworker had a family to support, or another who found that she was being paid less than her male coworkers after years of performing the same job and with the same seniority. And, Madam Speaker, I am fighting today for my two daughters so they have the same opportunities and the same rights as my two sons.

In the House, we know what our coworkers are making. We can look it up. We need our constituents to have that same opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I have joined my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the past on their motions. I believe deeply in the need for this body to come together today to focus on issues that matter to our families. It is time for my colleagues to now join me, because supporting women, supporting families, and supporting the American Dream is a shared value.

I know in New Jersey the equal pay bill passed with broad bipartisan support. In fact, in the entire State senate

and assembly, there were only two people who voted against it.

If there were ever a moment, if there were ever a bill, if there were ever a time to put obstruction aside, it is now. The motion put forth has nothing to do with equal pay, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 236, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

AYES—191

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

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Adams
Agullar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)

DesJarlais
Granger

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright

NOES—236

Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.

Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran

NOT VOTING—4

Griffith
Wilson (SC)

□ 1727

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.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam 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 242, nays 187, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—242

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

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch

Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—187

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

NOT VOTING—3

DesJarlais Granger Wilson (SC)

□ 1735

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. Res. 245 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$11,513,328; Committee on Armed Services, \$16,350,222; Committee on the Budget, \$10,380,424; Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, \$3,781,500; Committee on Education and Labor, \$14,578,714; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$21,147,384; Committee on Ethics, \$7,015,392; Committee on Financial Services, \$17,077,862; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$16,240,724; Committee on Homeland Security, \$15,308,002; Committee on House Administration, \$10,644,422; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$12,463,000; Committee on the Judiciary, \$15,860,594; Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, \$487,500; Committee on Natural Resources, \$13,895,926; Committee on Oversight and Reform, \$18,990,068; Committee on Rules, \$6,654,378; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$11,079,654; Committee on Small Business, \$6,196,296; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$17,830,330; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$8,276,384; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$18,266,864.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2019, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2020.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,756,664; Committee on Armed Services, \$8,175,111; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, \$1,890,750; Committee on Education and Labor, \$7,289,357; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$10,573,692; Committee on Ethics, \$3,507,696; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,538,931; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,120,362; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,654,001; Committee on House Administration, \$5,172,211; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$6,231,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,930,297; Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, \$450,000; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,947,963; Committee on Oversight and Reform, \$9,495,034; Committee on Rules, \$3,327,189; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,539,827; Committee on Small Business, \$3,098,148; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,915,165; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$4,138,192; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,133,432.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount

specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2020, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2021.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,756,664; Committee on Armed Services, \$8,175,111; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, \$1,890,750; Committee on Education and Labor, \$7,289,357; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$10,573,692; Committee on Ethics, \$3,507,696; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,538,931; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,120,362; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,654,001; Committee on House Administration, \$5,472,211; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$6,231,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,930,297; Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, \$37,500; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,947,963; Committee on Oversight and Reform, \$9,495,034; Committee on Rules, \$3,327,189; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,539,827; Committee on Small Business, \$3,098,148; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,915,165; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$4,138,192; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,133,432.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2020, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chair of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress.

(b) AMOUNT.—The reserve fund under this section shall have a balance of \$8,000,000, of which—

(1) \$1,500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2019, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2020; and

(2) \$6,500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2020, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2021.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a commonsense bill to protect the smallest and most vulnerable among us, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request can't be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. I would ask that the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1735

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1735.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY JENS STOLTENBERG, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CRAIG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING FLORENCE M. JOHNSON

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a community leader from Essex County, New Jersey, Ms. Florence M. Johnson. Ms. Johnson has been an exceptional leader across Essex County for the past four decades.

In the 1970s, she cofounded a housing development in East Orange, New Jersey, that was designed, built, and managed by African Americans—one of the first of its kind.

In the 1980s and 1990s, she was a trailblazing member of East Orange City Council.

In 2000, she joined the New Jersey Symphony Orchestra as an outreach and community engagement leader. At the New Jersey Symphony, Ms. Johnson led outreach to schools, churches, senior centers, and other organizations in order to make sure that the arts benefit everyone in the community.

This evening, she is being honored as a Hidden Figure in East Orange, New Jersey.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Florence M. Johnson for her leadership.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, tomorrow is National Vietnam War Veterans Day.

Madam Speaker, 46 years ago, March 29, 1973, the last combat troops were ordered out of Vietnam; and just 2 years ago, we designated March 29 as a national day to honor our Vietnam veterans.

Madam Speaker, in many instances, our Vietnam veterans often did not receive a warm welcome home when they returned from war. There were no parades, no welcome back ceremonies.

Our Vietnam veterans, many of whom were drafted, answered the Nation's call and served with honor and distinction.

Vietnam veterans constructed their own memorial here in Washington,

built entirely by private donations and dedicated to the 2.7 million servicemembers who served during the Vietnam war.

Madam Speaker, we all know someone who served in Vietnam. These veterans are our friends, our family, and neighbors. It is long overdue to salute them for their service, but it is not too late. This weekend, I will proudly be at the Cambria County War Memorial to mark this special day.

May God bless our Vietnam war veterans today, tomorrow, and every day. Welcome home.

□ 1745

SALTON SEA DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN

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

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address concerns about the Colorado River drought contingency plan and to sound the alarm and avoid a public health crisis at the Salton Sea in southern California.

To be clear, I support the goals of the DCP, which outlines voluntary water use cuts across seven Western States in the event of a worsening drought. However, I am concerned that the current proposal to implement the DCP provides an expansive waiver to the Bureau of Reclamation that could result in the reduction of water to the Salton Sea.

The Salton Sea is the largest inland body of water in all of California, and its very existence is already at risk. Ensuring the Salton Sea is protected as part of this agreement is critically important because, if the Salton Sea decline accelerates, thousands of lake beds will become exposed, subjecting residents of southern California to harmful dust that penetrates the lungs and can cause severe respiratory illness.

I look forward to working with the Natural Resources Committee to find a solution that prevents a broad waiver of Federal laws and that preserves water rights and critical environmental protections for its surrounding residents.

Madam Speaker, I support the goals of the DCP. However, I cannot in good conscience support implementation in a way that harms the Salton Sea or threatens the health of the people I serve.

CONSEQUENCES OF AIR FORCE RUNNING OUT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to raise the concerns of Floridians and Georgians who still await a supplemental appropriation from the Congress.

Every other major storm and disaster received a supplemental appropriation, but for some reason, victims of Hurricane Michael remain waiting.

The Air Force, expecting an appropriation, began the process of rebuilding Tyndall Air Force Base. This morning, the Air Force put out news that they have run out of O&M funds.

What does this mean? It means that, as of this morning, we have deferred 61 required facility projects at bases in 18 States across our country.

It means that, on May 1, we will stop work on Tyndall Air Force Base, failing to meet our obligations to rebuild.

It means that, on May 15, the Air Force will cut aircraft repairs, potentially endangering our pilots' safety when flying and limiting their training capacity.

Ultimately, it means that, on September 1, we will cut 18,000 training flying hours.

This is unacceptable in the current global environment. We must act now to ensure that the men and women serving in the Air Force are furnished with the tools to accomplish their missions.

This is our job as the Congress, and we need to do it immediately, since there are very few legislative days remaining before the Easter break.

WORLD WATER DAY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate World Water Day, just celebrated on March 22.

Water sustains life on Earth. It is critical to health, sanitation, food production, and the economy at large.

Tragically, over 2 billion people around our world lack access to safe drinking water, a humanitarian crisis. Some live in our country.

Limited access to freshwater is an ever-increasing risk to our national security as nations go to war over this precious resource. Meanwhile, terrorist organizations seek to control water resources to finance their destabilizing activities. That is why we must fully fund U.S. diplomatic leadership, to ensure that the looming conflicts over water can be nipped in the bud.

My own constituents in northern Ohio are acutely aware of how precious access to clean water can be. In the summer of 2014, fertilizer runoff led to massive clusters of harmful algae blooms in Lake Erie, compromising water supplies to over half a million residents of Toledo. Flint, Michigan, shortly thereafter, endured its own water crisis.

As the Appropriations Committee's Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee chair, I can assure you that our committee is working tirelessly to fight for improved infrastructure, environmental protections, and access to clean water.

Together, we will meet this crisis in our country and abroad and allow the

vital human right for freshwater to belong to everyone.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF BARBARA RICCA

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a dear friend and a model public servant from my district, Ms. Barbara Ricca of Newbury Township in Geauga County. Ms. Ricca passed away peacefully on Saturday morning, March 23, at the age of 95.

Barb proudly served as the legal secretary for Geauga County for over 30 years. She worked under five different prosecutors from both parties. In fact, when I became prosecutor, Barbara was my very first secretary.

She worked tirelessly until her retirement, but Barb did not retire from life. She worked just as hard as a volunteer at University Hospitals Geauga Medical Center and could be found baling hay on their family farm.

For relaxation, she played in the Great Geauga County Fair Band, of which she had been an original charter member since 1938. Most recently, I had the honor of pinning Barb at the Geauga County Fair to commemorate her 80th year of playing in the fair band.

Barb will not only be missed by her loving family and friends but by the entire Geauga County community.

May Barbara Ricca rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING FULLERTON COLLEGE BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, to my right is a picture of champs. I congratulate the Fullerton College men's basketball team for winning the State championship this last weekend.

This victory marks Fullerton College's fourth State championship title, but the first since 2006. This awesome performance is thanks to Coach Perry Webster and tournament MVP Lance Coleman, sophomore Rodrick McCobb, and the rest of the talented players.

I am honored to recognize these fine young men. These players are going to be role models, and they are going to be leaders in our community. These men have learned a lesson, which is that hard work and determination pay off.

These are our State champions. Congratulations to Coach Webster and the Hornets. They have earned this victory.

Go Hornets.

CONGRATULATING LAKELAND CHRISTIAN SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL TEAM

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lakeland Christian School Mock Trial team for winning second place in the Florida High School Mock Trial Competition.

The team previously won first place in regionals and went on to win not only second place among all teams in Florida but also the Stephen Shenkman Professionalism Award and the Best Attorney award, which was granted to Abby Branham.

In addition to Abby, the team included Ama Fosu, Annie Bolter, Trent Curtis, Keaton Walding, Jace Gravitt, Faith Nagy, Emily Branham, Lucy Bolter, Seth Martinez, Tag Hunt, Riley Rhoden, Carter Sawicki, Haley Caylor, and Aline Peek.

These students dedicated many hours of hard work and preparation to learn the facts of their case and present them thoughtfully in the competition. I am confident the knowledge they gained will help them become active members of our community in college and beyond.

Their success comes not only from their own hard work but also from the mentors who guided them through the process. The talented students were coached by Chasity Branham, professor of criminal justice at Polk State College, and Judge Melissa Gravitt, who recently assumed the bench for Florida's 10th Judicial Circuit.

These women took many hours out of their busy schedules to impart their passion for justice to these students. I appreciate all that they do. Our next generation is made better by their service.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JUDGE RAMON GARCIA

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

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and service of a gentleman, the Honorable Ramon Garcia.

Judge Garcia recently completed his third term as the Hidalgo County judge, serving with honor and distinction during his tenure. Judge Garcia was first elected in 2002. At the end of his tenure in 2006, Judge Garcia left Hidalgo County in the best financial position it had ever been in, in its history.

Judge Garcia returned for a second round as Hidalgo County judge, being elected for a second term in 2010, and a third term in 2014, having served until this year in 2019.

His leadership and fiscally responsible policies have paved the way for Hidalgo County to construct a much-needed county courthouse. The Hidalgo County Commissioners Court officially named the courthouse's law library the "Hidalgo County Judge Ramon Garcia Law Library," paying homage to his positive contributions to Hidalgo County.

Ramon Garcia was born in 1948 at the old McAllen General Hospital, the current location of McAllen City Hall. He graduated with honors from the University of Houston, Bates College of Law, in 1972, and passed the State bar the same year.

He began practicing in 1973 with Joe B. Evins, who was an attorney at the time but would later go on to be the State district judge in our county.

Recently, Judge Garcia formed a coalition of community leaders to plan for the 2020 Census and ensure that Hidalgo County is accurately counted. The coalition's work is recognized statewide and by other city and county governments that are facing similar situations.

Today, Hidalgo County continues its fight for representation and entitlement funds, and they owe many thanks to Judge Garcia for his tireless work.

Madam Speaker, Judge Garcia is a pillar in our community. There are many reasons to admire the work of Judge Garcia. I personally thank the judge for his exemplary work in government, but I most admire his trial and advocacy skills that he has used to advocate for south Texas.

He has challenged the status quo as a litigator and as our county judge to the benefit of south Texans. It is a privilege to represent resilient, hard-working individuals like him.

RECOGNIZING CINCINNATI MOELLER CRUSADERS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, the Cincinnati Moeller Crusaders have done it again, back-to-back Ohio Division I basketball champs 2 years in a row.

The Crusaders defeated the strong Akron Saint Vincent-Saint Mary team over the weekend, 52-44, to take the championship.

Moeller was undefeated this season going 29-0. In fact, going back to last season, it is their 49th win in a row in a league and a State known for great high school basketball teams.

As a graduate of a Greater Catholic League rival school, La Salle, I have to acknowledge that Moeller is strong in just about everything. In fact, my senior year at La Salle, Moeller was the only team to beat us in football, even with me anchoring the La Salle defensive line.

To Moeller's players, especially the seniors who will be graduating, the coaches, parents, teachers, and fans, congratulations. I wish them all the best in the future—unless, of course, they are playing my alma mater, La Salle.

REPEALING AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WOULD HAVE HARMFUL PERCUSSIONS

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I want to share the story of a family in my district. In 2015, the Cerrato family was in the NICU, fighting for the life of their son Ethan. At just 10 days old, he had undergone two major surgeries, had been the subject of dozens of procedures, and had spent the first days of his life traumatized and struggling through pain.

After only 10 days, the Cerrato family had accumulated a hospital bill of over \$250,000. While little Ethan was fighting for his life, Christine and Matthew Cerrato were grappling with the thought of filing for bankruptcy.

At this moment, the question became: What could they rely on? The answer was the Affordable Care Act, which was passed into law this week 9 years ago.

Earlier this week, the Department of Justice called on the Federal courts to overturn the ACA in its entirety, the latest attack from this administration on the affordable healthcare of millions of families, including many in my State of Colorado and in my district.

These relentless efforts to repeal this law would have harmful impacts on families across the country, like the Cerrato family.

We cannot move backward on the progress we have made to provide affordable healthcare to American families. Instead, we must move forward to lower drug prices, to lower the cost of healthcare, and to ensure that Colorado families and families all over America can get the care they need.

HONORING CHER KONDOR

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I am proud to honor some remarkable women in my district.

Today, I am recognizing Ms. Cher Kondor, who I had the honor of meeting just recently. Cher is a Gold Star mother. Her son, Martin Kondor, was a U.S. Army specialist killed in Baqubah, Iraq, in 2004.

Of course, Ms. Kondor was devastated, but she decided to do something in his honor and in honor of all the other veterans who have served, particularly those who have sacrificed their lives for our freedom.

She created a memorial veterans garden called the Gold Star Garden in York County and has raised, since the time it was created, nearly \$1 million for the garden. This beautiful, living monument is a gathering place for those who want to commemorate and remember the fallen and celebrate the lives of our sons and daughters who volunteered to protect this country.

Ms. Kondor honors our Nation's veterans, and it is a privilege to recognize her contribution to our community on the House floor today.

We are thankful for her example and for her continued awareness of the sac-

rifices of those who have fought for us and for our freedom.

I am proud to honor Ms. Kondor.

□ 1800

BIPARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to the Members of the House. We are all here because the American people made it so.

The diversity of our Nation's political ideals is boundless. That is what made our country what it is today. We are here to represent these vast ideals.

The definition of bipartisanship is of or involving the agreement or cooperation of two political parties that usually oppose each other's policies. It is about cooperation, it is about compromise, and it is about working together with those who don't have the same exact ideals as you.

I am asking for the membership of this House to think on the idea of bipartisanship. It is my belief that we owe it to the American people to work together.

MUELLER INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, we, our country, over the past 2 years have lived through persistent and daily accusations against our President of Russian collusion in his election, accusations made by many Democrats and the media. Our President was accused of nothing short of high crimes and misdemeanors.

A 2-year, thorough investigation was carried out. Last Friday, perhaps the most thorough investigation in recent history concluded. The investigation enjoyed not only complete, unlimited access to witnesses, but the resources of the entire Federal Government, including the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the intelligence community.

The Mueller investigation reached a conclusion that no Russian collusion took place nor was there any evidence of any participation by any persons in the campaign.

The verdict is in. Nevertheless, our Democrat colleagues continue to talk about a further investigation. Any further investigations would not have the fraction of resources of the Mueller investigation.

I ask: Seriously? Another investigation? This one was not enough? Or are we prolonging for the sake of prolonging this issue?

We owe it to the American people to accept the facts from a 2-year investigation, move on, and do the work we were sent here to do. We owe this to the American people.

ISRAEL: AMERICA'S INDISPENSABLE ALLY

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of America's indispensable ally, Israel. Israel is the brightest beacon of hope and freedom in the Middle East.

I proudly attended AIPAC's policy conference this week. Their mission is more important than ever.

Anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment is rampant across the world and, sadly, is found even in this Chamber. I am appalled one of my colleagues is so brazen as to resurrect old lies of Jewish conspiracies, propaganda used to oppress the Jewish people for centuries.

Elsewhere, Iran's puppet, Assad, seeks to take Israel's land for strategic leverage in Iran's mission to wipe Israel off the map.

I am proud to stand with President Trump in defense of our ally, Israel. I am grateful he chose to recognize the Golan Heights as a part of Israel and proud we now officially recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

HONORING ROY BENAVIDEZ

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

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Master Sergeant Roy Benavidez. On the occasion of the Roy P. Benavidez Memorial Highway dedication, my district is proud to claim this Medal of Honor recipient as our own.

Sergeant Benavidez answered the call to serve his country in Vietnam. At one crucial time while overseas, he voluntarily boarded a rescue helicopter and put his own life on the line to save his fellow soldiers.

During the rescue effort, he was shot multiple times, bayoneted, and hit by grenade fragments as he fought for 6 hours to protect his wounded comrades. He saved the lives of at least eight men.

After returning home, he went before Congress to advocate for better veteran healthcare. He then devoted the rest of his life to service, speaking to students about the importance of education and inspiring American troops around the world.

May this highway serve as a memorial to this brave and selfless American, Master Sergeant Roy Benavidez.

NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I grew up in the district I serve where I have

seen firsthand the results of the failing to hold those in power accountable to the laws of the land. From corporate polluters who continue to violate the Clean Air Act with no real enforcement to stop the violations that hurt our public health, I have also seen firsthand a megabillionaire who directly violated Federal and State processes that resulted in thousands of trucks to rumble through our local neighborhoods where one in five children have asthma.

Do you know why those in power looked the other way? Because of political influence on my colleagues who then became conflicted.

This is why I rise today to put forward H. Res. 257, which creates a transparent process to ensure the protection of our democracy. That ensures that we don't have a lawless society that results in irreparable harm to the American people.

Doing nothing when we are seeing a blatant disregard of the United States Constitution and our ethical norms is dangerous. No one, Madam Speaker, including the President of the United States, is above the law.

I know many have focused on actions that were conducted prior to his taking the oath of office, and that is important. However, as critically important are the actions by the President after he swore to uphold the United States Constitution before all of us.

He is not a CEO, Madam Speaker, anymore, but a public servant who is held accountable not to shareholders and investors, but the actual American people, real people, people who expect all of us to follow the laws.

In the 2 years since he took office, President Trump racked up more than 1,400 conflicts of interest involving the government, those trying to influence it and The Trump Organization, according to a report released by the Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington.

President Trump used the Presidency to enrich himself by repeatedly promoting his businesses as extensions of his administration. Political allies, wealthy donors, special interests, and foreign governments have adopted a key tactic of patronizing Trump's businesses to garner favor with the Trump administration.

Here are some of the key findings from CREW's tracking of Trump's conflicts of interest:

President Trump made 118 visits to his properties in his second year in office, bringing his 2-year total to 281 visits to properties he still profits from while serving as President of the United States.

In his second year in office, President Trump and other White House staff promoted Trump businesses on at least 87 occasions. More than 150 political committees, including campaigns and party committees, have spent nearly \$5 million at Trump businesses since he became President. At least 13 special interest groups lobbied the White

House since Trump's inauguration, some for the first time, around the same time they also patronized a Trump property.

At least three foreign governments held events at Trump properties during Trump's second year in office. Two of those countries did so after holding similar events elsewhere in previous years.

Not only has President Trump still refused to divest from his businesses, he seems to have doubled down by reinforcing the idea that The Trump Organization is an extension of the Trump administration.

These offenses must be investigated.

In total, CREW found more than 900 conflicts in the second year of the Trump administration. This presents a clear picture of a Presidency used to turn a profit and the President's businesses serving at points of access to the corridors of power.

This report shows that special interests, foreign governments, and political allies continue to pour money into Trump's bank accounts while the American public is left in the dark about whether or not the President's policy decisions are made in the best interests of our country, or is it in the best interests of the President's bottom line, benefiting himself personally.

We have been sent here to legislate. I am thinking about the historic For the People Act we passed right here in this Chamber, the gun reform package we passed, legislation to protect our lands, to increase and strengthen healthcare for Americans, and much more.

I am proud of my first bills. One protects our public health in regards to petroleum coke exposure, and the other, which has a wide range of support, would prohibit the use of credit scores by the auto insurance industry.

However, Madam Speaker, none of these bills is free from the harm that comes from the current administration and the President of the United States not complying with the clauses of the United States Constitution. When these conflicts and direct violations to the Emoluments Clause are not investigated, we set a dangerous precedent that those issues we passed in this Chamber are not important.

I think about the recent announcement that T-Mobile and Sprint would like the Federal Government to approve a merger between the two companies. In the same breath, T-Mobile spent close to \$200,000 at the D.C. Trump hotel. This is what we call an upgraded version of pay to play, and it dangerously corrupts our democracy.

When President Truman sidestepped the Constitution and went to war, every sitting President had done the same. One of the first major challenges to the War Powers Act came in 1981 when President Reagan deployed military personnel to El Salvador without consulting or submitting a report to Congress.

In 1999, President Clinton continued a bombing campaign in Kosovo beyond

the 60-day limit cited in the law. A more recent War Powers Act dispute arose in 2011 when President Barack Obama initiated a military action in Libya without congressional authorization.

You see, Madam Speaker, when we do nothing, we set a precedent and allow it to become the norm. I can't stress enough how dangerous this is to the core of our democracy.

This will not be the last billionaire CEO who runs for President who will attempt to not divest from his business interests.

Now, what we have witnessed from this administration are acts that could very well be impeachable offenses outside of the scope of the Mueller investigation. We have a duty in this Chamber to inquire about these acts, to investigate them, to find out if there was any wrongdoing, and to seek accountability if it has been found.

That is why, today, I have introduced a resolution that calls on the Judiciary Committee to inquire into these activities that may be impeachable offenses. There are serious pieces of evidence out there, many that have come through the various committees of this body, in the media, and things within the public eye. An investigation will take a look at all of those things with the question: Are these impeachable offenses? Is our President acting above the rule of law?

As Congress, we have a job to ensure that is exactly what is not happening. If, at the end, it gets the President to comply, then we have done our job. If the President doesn't, then we move forward and, at the very least, put any future President on notice: Congress will hold you accountable and will require you to divest in your businesses.

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

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

IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is always an honor to stand in the well of the House of Representatives.

Each time I am afforded this opportunity, I have tried to savor the moment knowing that it is not eternal and knowing that, at some point, we will no longer have this preeminent privilege. But I do appreciate having the opportunity to serve the people of the Ninth Congressional District and to serve my country. I love my country.

I thank the gentlewoman for what she has done with H. Res. 257. I support this resolution, and I would like to compliment the lady for what she has done since she has arrived in Congress.

□ 1815

She has truly hit the ground running. She came from the State house. She is a lawyer. She has been an advocate, and she understands the issues associated with criminal justice. So I thank her for what she has done and what she is doing with this resolution.

Madam Speaker, it was never intended for the executive branch of the government to investigate itself.

The Framers of the Constitution, in Federalist 65, addressed this. Federalist 65, the Federalist Papers.

I invite people to please read the Federalist Papers. If you can't read them all, just read Federalist 65 and 69.

Some things are made perspicuously clear. One of the things made clear is that impeachment is solely within the province of the House of Representatives.

Madison, the fourth President of the United States of America; Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; and Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America—these are the authors of the Federalist Papers, and they were prophetic with some of their writings.

While I would not agree with all that they did in their lifetimes, I will tell you that what they have done with reference to impeachment is prophetic, because they understood that at some point you could have a President who was unfit to hold office, but who had not committed a crime but should be removed from office before the next election because of the harm the President is imposing upon society.

Understanding this, they were in support of Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution, which deals with treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors as the means by which a President can be removed from office after having been elected.

They understood that there might be a time such as this and a President such as Trump.

They understood that we, the Members of this august body, should be empowered such that we could take up the cause of the American people. Not because we are Democrats, because it is not about Democrats; it is about democracy. Not because we are Republicans, because it is not about Republicans; it is about the Republic and what Franklin said when he called to our attention: You have a Republic if you can keep it.

It is about maintaining this Republic. They were prophetic. They understood that you cannot allow the executive branch to investigate itself, because if you allow such to happen, you find yourself with what has happened with Mr. Mueller.

He has investigated, but he cannot hand it over to us because he is an agent of the executive branch of government. And, as an agent of the executive branch of government, he is required to submit his report to the executive branch, a report that is all about

the head of the executive branch of the government.

This is why the Framers understood that it was necessary to empower another branch of government to do this. How prophetic and how wise they were to do so.

It was not intended that we would outsource this investigation to the executive branch, which is, in essence, what has occurred. We have allowed the executive branch to assume what is truly the responsibility and the duty and the obligation of the House of Representatives.

This is ours. This is what we must do.

When there was a Republican administration in this House, I indicated that I wouldn't get in the way of that investigation, but I also indicated that the House should do its job.

And if the House is to do its job, it is contemplated that the Judiciary Committee would do exactly what the Representative from the 13th Congressional District in Michigan is doing now and, that is, take up the question of impeachment in the Judiciary Committee by way of a resolution such as what she has called to the attention of this Congress.

I salute her for doing so because this is what was contemplated by the Framers of the Constitution. This is what Madison contemplated, Jay contemplated, and Hamilton contemplated.

And, to give further evidence of what they contemplated, we but only have to review the impeachment in 1868 of Andrew Johnson.

Andrew Johnson was impeached in Article X of the Articles of Impeachment against him for speaking ill of Congress.

There is no requirement that the President commit a crime, that the President commit an offense for which he must be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt before a President can be impeached.

Congress determines what the standard is for impeachment. Unfortunately, we have allowed what happens on the judicial side of the law to be conflated with what happens on the political side of the law.

The judiciary, or the judicial side, would have a crime. This is what Mr. Mueller was investigating, to see if a crime had been committed—a crime. And, if a crime is committed, of course the President can be impeached for committing a crime.

But the President can also be impeached if he has not committed a crime, but he is doing harm to society. This is the law.

When we say no person is above the law, we are talking about not only the law as it is codified with reference to criminality, but also the law as it has been codified such that impeachment can be the punishment in the sense that the President would be indicted.

It is not the same as an indictment, but it is quite similar, and the President would then have to face trial in

the Senate, presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

There is no punishment, *per se*, with this entire process. It is just a means by which a President is removed from office. And, if he has committed a crime, he can, of course, still be prosecuted for the criminal activity.

So, tonight, we are here to thank the Member for what she has done in filing this resolution, H. Res. 257. We are here tonight to acknowledge that the Framers of the Constitution contemplated what she has done. She is in order.

We are here tonight to acknowledge that it is now within the hands of the Judiciary Committee, this resolution, and it is my prayer that the Judiciary Committee would take this resolution and bring it to a vote.

I believe that it is time for us to do what the Constitution contemplates by way of the words of the Framers and by way of what Federalist 65 has called to our attention.

However, I still stand tonight where I stood when I initially took to the floor of the House of Representatives and indicated that this President should be impeached. I stand where I stood then, and I also stand on the premise that, if the Judiciary Committee does not act, any Member of this august body can bring impeachment to a vote.

I stand on this. This is what the rules allow. And as a Member of Congress, I have given an assurance that there will be another vote on impeachment in the House of Representatives.

I will do it. I don't like using personal pronouns because my mother always said: "Alexander, whatever you will do, you will do with others."

But, because of the way the process is codified, I will do it because I love my country.

I will do it because I understand that we have a person who is unfit to be President holding this office.

I will do it because I want to protect the democracy.

I will do it because I believe in the Republic.

I will do it because I salute the flag and I believe in liberty and justice for all.

I will do it because I believe that Lincoln was right when he spoke of government of the people, by the people, for the people being forever a part of our country, our land.

I will do it because it is the appropriate thing to do at a time such as this, with a President such as Trump.

And finally this, Madam Speaker, I have not suggested that I have whipped or would whip, meaning encourage others to vote a certain way. I have consistently said you should vote your conscience.

I still stand by it. Vote your conscience. Vote your conscience, knowing that, at some point on the infinite continuum that we call time—at some point on the infinite continuum that we call time, there will be people who will review our actions through the vista of time.

And, when they review our actions, the query will be: What did they do when they had an opportunity to take up the cause of justice?

They will want to know what did we do. And the only way they can know what we did is for there to be a vote.

At some point, we have to move beyond talking points to action items. The only way to make this an action item is for there to be a vote.

And those who look through the vista of time, perhaps generations unborn, when they look through the vista of time, they will want to see the record. And the record will show where we stood when we had the opportunity to remove an unfit person from office, an unfit President.

The record will show where we stood, but, more importantly, it will give them some clues as to what was happening in this House at the time. It will give them some evidence of where we were.

And I assure you, Madam Speaker, at some point on this infinite continuum, people are going to ask the question: What was wrong with them? What was wrong with them?

They had a President who was separating babies from their mothers at the border, with no means of reuniting them.

Babies are still separated from their parents.

They will want to know: What was wrong with them? They allowed this?

They will want to know: How could you decide that you are going to take up the cause against persons who make commentary in the House, but you won't take up the cause against a President who went so far as to say there were some fine people among the bigots, the racists, the xenophobes, the homophobes, the Islamophobes, the nativists; among those persons who marched and proclaimed "Jews will not replace us," persons who said, "blood and soil."

How could you allow this to go unchallenged?

They will want to know: What was wrong with them? Why would they allow such a person to continue in office, a person who demeans the country when he demeans its heroes, a person who demeans persons by simply deciding that name-calling is more appropriate than debating issues.

And, by the way, calling a person who is a bigot a bigot is not name-calling. That is properly labeling the actions of a person, the behavior of a person.

And, by the way, for those who may not have paid attention, if you have been following these various TV programs, news programs, information sources, host after host, persons who are being interviewed, have said that the President is a racist. They have said that the President is a bigot.

I understand that it is difficult for some to say. Not for me. Not for me. I know what bigotry looks like. I know what racism smells like. I know what

it sounds like. I know what it tastes like. I suffered through it.

□ 1830

I would not want to see what I had to endure become a part of the fiber and fabric of this country ever again. Whenever we see evidence of this ugliness rearing its head, we should do what we can to stare it down and stop it.

I stand here tonight believing that we have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to allow what this Congresswoman has called to our attention to move forward. I stand on the Constitution in saying this, and I will stand with her. I am proud to be associated with her and what she is doing.

When we do bring this to a vote, my hope is that every Member will vote his or her conscience. That is all that I ask, just vote your conscience, and let the record reflect where we stood.

As Dr. King put it, the truest measure of a person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience. The truest measure of a person is where you stand in times of challenge and controversy.

These are times of challenge and controversy. The question is, where do we stand? The record will show where we stand.

There are some who will say that this is going to be a hard vote. I have a sense of what hard votes are like. I have had to take some hard votes since I have been in Congress. I have had to take some hard votes and never had a person say thank you for taking that hard vote. I have taken my share of hard votes.

I have some members of the clergy that still have not found favor with some of the votes that I have taken, but I took them because it was the principled thing to do, because it was the constitutional thing to do, because it was not only the right thing to do, but the righteous thing to do. So I know what hard votes are like.

People expect me to take hard votes, and they expect me, after I take my hard votes, to go back and convince my constituents that I did the right thing. Nobody seeks to protect me from hard votes. I know what hard votes are like.

I understand when people say this would be a hard vote. I understand it. But that is why we came. We were elected to take hard votes. If it were easy, then we wouldn't be here. Other folk would do the easy things. People who get elected to Congress are expected to take hard votes, to do that which is difficult.

Let us understand that the record will reflect the vote. It will give people who look through the vista of time some indication as to why we are doing what we are doing and have not done what we should have done.

Madam Speaker, again, I am proud to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I never take for granted this preeminent privilege. I will always be grateful to the Speaker

of the House and all the various officers of this House for permitting the time. I am grateful, and I thank them for being as magnanimous, if you will, as they are, but also for following the rules and allowing me to speak. This is a great opportunity.

I pray that we who hold public trust will honor the Constitution of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to say that I yield back the balance of my time.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 252.—An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of colonel in the regular Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notification to Congress of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 12304b, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304(f); Public Law 94-286, Sec. 1; (90 Stat. 517); to the Committee on Armed Services.

495. A letter from the Under Secretary, Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department is not submitting a formal report to Congress in response to Sec. 2803, Sub. Sec. (c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act due to funding not made available; to the Committee on Armed Services.

496. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Sustainment, Department of State, transmitting a notification that the assembly of the required report on the Department's Operational Energy Strategy will be completed at the end of May 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

497. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidance for the Standard for Borrower Defense to Repayment Applications; Institutions' Notifications of Financial Responsibility Events, Actions, and Conditions; Implementation of the Class Action Bans and Predispute Arbitration Agreements Provisions; the Repayment Rate and Financial Protection Disclosures Provisions of the 2016 Borrower Defense to Repayment Regulations (RIN: 1840-

AD19) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

498. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Service, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2015-OPE-0103] (RIN: 1840-AD19) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

499. A letter from the Chair, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Thirteenth Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) OF 1996, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 242k(k)(7); Public Law 104-191, Sec. 263; (110 Stat. 2033); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

500. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Treasury Department licenses during the period from July 1 through December 31, 2018, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102(g)); (110 Stat. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

501. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

502. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

503. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

504. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

505. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Bureau's 2018 Transportation Statistics Annual Report, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 6312; Public Law 112-141, Sec. 52011(a); (126 Stat. 894); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

506. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Alaska Towns; Toksook Bay, AK; Unalakleet, AK; Wainwright, AK; and Yakutat, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0350; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AAL-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

507. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Amendment of Class D Airspace, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Tacoma, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1032; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

508. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31235; Amdt. No.: 3837] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

509. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31231; Amdt. No.: 3833] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

510. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31232; Amdt. No.: 3834] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

511. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31239; Amdt. No.: 3840] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

512. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31238; Amdt. No.: 3839] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

513. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31236;

Amdt. No.: 3838] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

514. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0962; Product Identifier 2018-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-19560; AD 2019-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

515. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0580; Product Identifier 2018-NM-025-AD; Amendment 39-19558; AD 2019-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

516. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0409; Product Identifier 2017-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-19559; AD 2019-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

517. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0907; Product Identifier 2018-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-19562; AD 2019-03-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

518. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0906; Product Identifier 2018-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-19561; AD 2019-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

519. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0508; Product Identifier 2018-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-19563; AD 2019-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

520. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0385; Product Identifier 2018-CE-019-AD; Amendment 39-19554; AD 2019-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

521. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D

and Class E Airspace; Atwater, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1091; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-26] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

522. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Corry, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0998; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AEA-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

523. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Schenectady, NY, Ithaca, NY, and Albany, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0256; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AEA-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1585. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-21, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Natural Resources, and Veterans' Affairs, discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1585 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CRIST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHRIER, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 9. A bill to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1895. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1896. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand the military student identifier program to cover students with a parent who serves in the reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1897. A bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 1898. A bill to modify the prohibition on United States assistance and financing for certain exports to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, 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 Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KATKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 1899. A bill to provide for the refinancing and recalculation of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1900. A bill to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 1901. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 1902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury to provide to taxpayers information regarding low-income taxpayer clinics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1903. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 1904. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 1905. A bill to require notice from the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the nonbusiness energy property credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualification requirements with respect to certain multiple employer plans with pooled plan providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr.

FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1908. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1909. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise rules relating to general solicitation or general advertising to allow for presentations or other communication made by or on behalf of an issuer at certain events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 1910. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 1911. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to expand certain benefits for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for requirements relating to documentation for major acquisition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 1913. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay educational assistance or subsistence allowances to certain individuals during school term, quarter, or semester breaks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 1914. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to national priority safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1915. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 1916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide alternative minimum funding rules for certain single-employer plans maintained by a community newspaper; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1917. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1918. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bozeman, Montana, as the "Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 1919. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to provide chronic wasting disease support for States and coordinated response efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1920. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a higher Federal matching rate for increased expenditures under Medicaid for mental and behavioral health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1921. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to ocean acidification; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 1922. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 1923. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue quarter dollars in commemoration of the Nineteenth Amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 1924. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care to veterans at Vet Centers in the same manner as the Secretary provides child care to veterans at other Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1925. A bill to designate the Manhattan Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the "Margaret Cochran Corbin Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

H.R. 1926. A bill to provide temporary protected status for certain nationals of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1927. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 1928. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to impose penalties for State noncompliance with enforcement of immigration law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 1929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the qualified fuel cell motor vehicles credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1930. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 1931. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat as compensation for purposes of retirement contribution limitations any difficulty of care payments excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1933. A bill to prohibit States from retroactively imposing a sales tax collection duty on a remote seller, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1934. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to prepare and submit periodic reports to Congress on the role of telecommunications in hate crimes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr.

KATKO, Mr. COLE, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEIL, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. REED, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BOST, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to enhance provisions related to pay discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify the terms of the Jackson Gulch rehabilitation project in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to small employers providing an eligible automatic contribution arrangement under a retirement savings plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the health coverage tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mrs. MILLER):

H.R. 1940. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make available parental leave benefits to parents following the birth or adoption of a child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REED, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically and continue to provide critical benefits to Americans and United States communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. REED):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the first Friday of October as "Manufacturing Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 257. A resolution inquiring whether the House of Representatives should impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 258. A resolution affirming United States support for the continued implementation of the Treaty of Peace between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H. Res. 259. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the repatriation of religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq to their ancestral homelands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 260. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Middle Level Education Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY:

H. Res. 261. A resolution strongly condemning the February 2019 terrorist attack in India, offering condolences to the family and friends of the victims, and reaffirming solidarity with the people of India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H. Res. 262. A resolution recognizing linemen, the profession of linemen, the contributions of these brave men and women who protect public safety, and expressing support for the designation of April 18, 2019, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H. Res. 263. A resolution expressing support for the designation of April 9, 2019, as National Yellow Ribbon Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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 Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 9.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the civil asset forfeiture procedures and Section 8, Clause 9 extends to Congress the power to create inferior courts and to make rules of procedure and evidence for such courts.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 1896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerate powers listed in Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution, to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 1900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 1902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 1905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 1908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV,

Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 1911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 1912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 1913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 9

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 1919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1923.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 1924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 To raise and support Armies.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 1926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1, Sentence 1, and Section 2, Clauses 1 and 4 of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress; Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; and, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "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. RESCHENTHALER:

H.R. 1928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 1929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "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 of Officer thereof."

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 1931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. SCHRIER:
H.R. 1932.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the Constitution.
By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 1933.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. SERRANO:
H.R. 1934.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.
By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 1935.
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. TIPTON:
H.R. 1936.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. TORRES of California:
H.R. 1937.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.
Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mrs. TRAHAN:
H.R. 1938.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;
By Mr. TURNER:
H.R. 1939.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. WAGNER:
H.R. 1940.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 35: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 36: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BERA, and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 64: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 94: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 95: Mr. VELA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LATTI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 96: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.
H.R. 101: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 148: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 154: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 216: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 218: Mr. MAST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. PALMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 250: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 296: Mr. GOODEN.
H.R. 299: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BRADY, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 309: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 310: Mr. PETERS and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 332: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 336: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 397: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 400: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 444: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 445: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 446: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 500: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 510: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 530: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 553: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 555: Mr. CLAY and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 578: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 594: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 602: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 613: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 638: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 641: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 651: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 663: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 693: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 759: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 763: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 784: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 808: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 824: Mr. KEATING, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 835: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 838: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 846: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 849: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 855: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 861: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 873: Mr. POCAN and Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 888: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 897: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 912: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 938: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 943: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 945: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 962: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 965: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. CRAIG.
H.R. 986: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 987: Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALONE, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1002: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1004: Mr. EVANS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1006: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1007: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1010: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1035: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1043: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1044: Mr. BEYER and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1046: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1095: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1096: Mr. LONG and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1098: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1111: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1134: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1139: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WEXTON, and Mrs. CRAIG.
H.R. 1146: Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. WILD, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 1166: Ms. WILD, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1175: Mr. KILMER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HOLDING, and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 1179: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1186: Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 1289: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1305: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1306: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1307: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1311: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
H.R. 1327: Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 1345: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1358: Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 1360: Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 1384: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1385: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1386: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1396: Mrs. LURIA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VELA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. TLAI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIREN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1398: Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SEVELL of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1400: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1418: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1423: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1425: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 1499: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1527: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1572: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1588: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 1595: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1597: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1602: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1629: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 1641: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 1652: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1668: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1673: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 1679: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of

Ohio, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. VELA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1680: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1706: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1715: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1721: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1722: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1735: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1739: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1740: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1748: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1753: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1755: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1759: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1762: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1770: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1781: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1830: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1837: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SPANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MAST, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms.

TITUS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1846: Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1854: Mr. KATKO and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1855: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1857: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1860: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1884: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KIND, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CROW, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HECK, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.J. Res. 38: Ms. MENG.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. GRANGER and Ms. ADAMS.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. RUSH and Ms. TLAIB.

H. Res. 27: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 49: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GOODEN.

H. Res. 60: Ms. DEAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 107: Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 124: Mr. KIND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H. Res. 138: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. VAN DREW.

H. Res. 154: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. DELGADO.

H. Res. 190: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H. Res. 220: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 221: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 222: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 231: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 241: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 246: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KIND, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SPANO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CASE, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. COLE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1735: Ms. MOORE.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2019

No. 53

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 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.

Eternal God, from whom all blessings flow, we thank You for the gift of this day. Inspire us to use these precious hours and minutes to glorify Your Name. Lord, give us the wisdom to number our days that we may have hearts of wisdom. Guide our Senators with strength, courage, hope, and love. Empower them to build bridges that will keep America strong. Use them to pull down barriers of contention and replace them with gates that lead to harmony and peace. Lord, do for our lawmakers more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will re-

sume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 268, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute as in morning business.

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

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, yesterday, we had debate on the Green New Deal. I wonder how many Americans realize that this debate on the Green New Deal was not on a bill before the Congress that would become law but was on nothing but a non-binding resolution. Rather than working on specific changes in the law, the authors chose vague aspirations for dramatic action in the future. That is the difference between an active environmentalist and an environmental activist.

I am proud of my accomplishments that have had a real, positive impact on the environment. For instance, I authored the production tax credit for wind energy back in 1992. During my leadership on the Senate Finance Committee in the 2000s, I oversaw the establishment, enhancement, and renewal of numerous clean energy tax incentives.

My point is not to say that I made some impact on the environment but to say that there is a difference between offering a bill and, in turn, just a nonbinding resolution, which—the Democrats haven't put forth any real law.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, my Democratic colleagues in this body offered the American peo-

ple a crystal-clear picture of what the Democratic Party stands for in 2019 and whom it represents. Nearly all of our Democratic colleagues wrapped their arms around the radical policy they have marketed to the public as the Green New Deal.

I am sure we will be hearing carefully crafted spin about the transparent political maneuvering behind voting present instead of voting yes. Not exactly "Profiles in Courage." Not exactly "Profiles in Courage."

I am also certain that we will hear more indignant claims that I somehow sabotaged the legislation they said they support by actually bringing it to a vote. That is a fascinating sight in the Senate—the cosponsors of a policy complaining bitterly that they actually had to go on record to actually vote for a bill they supposedly support, but go on record they did. They can call it voting present. They can call it voting yes. But when every single Senate Democrat running for President has signed on as a cosponsor, when all of the energy and momentum in the Democratic Party is behind this, when just a tiny handful of Democratic Senators could bring themselves to vote against it on the floor, what we have is a Democratic Party that is fixated on satisfying the far left, even at the cost of crushing—crushing—working-class and middle-class American life as we know it.

Yesterday, the vast majority of Senate Democrats could not dismiss something as crazy as ending the production of American oil, coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy within a decade. They couldn't vote against that.

Senate Democrats could not dismiss something as absolutely ludicrous as a federally mandated overhaul of every building in America to meet the greenness—greenness—standards of Washington bureaucrats.

Senate Democrats could not reject a plan to take more control over where Americans choose to live, how they

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2011

choose to get around, and how they earn a living.

Senate Democrats could not even reject a plan that, according to rough estimates, could raise families' utility bills by hundreds of dollars a month and cost the U.S. Government more than the entire 2017 GDP of the whole world. They couldn't vote against that.

American manufacturing, American agriculture, industries, jobs, houses, farms, buildings, and cars that make up daily life for millions of working Americans—Democrats want Washington, DC, to declare war on all of that because it doesn't comply with the latest fashions in Brooklyn or San Francisco. They want to march the entire country toward extreme environmentalist goals that even President Obama's former Secretary of Energy has dismissed as impossible. That is what the Democratic Party of 2019 apparently has become.

Remember, their last Presidential nominee bragged, after her loss, that at least she had won all the places in America that are "optimistic, diverse, dynamic, [and] moving forward." We can fill in the blanks and see how they view all the other places that millions of Americans call home, those places that just aren't enlightened enough to vote for Democrats, places where farm jobs and factory jobs really matter, places where expensive high-speed rail and electric cars and trucks simply will not get the job done, places where soaring electric bills represent a kitchen-table crisis and not just a minor inconvenience, and places that are actually home to the workers who would be, as the resolution breezily puts it, "affected by the transition"—in other words, jobs shipped overseas and workers out in the cold. In Democrats' eyes, all of us in these places are just backward and out-of-date. People who live in those areas are just backward and out-of-date. Our lives need to be transformed by Washington, DC, bureaucrats, whether we like it or not.

The disruption isn't limited to just environmental and energy issues; there are so many more things Washington Democrats want to get their hands around.

Democrats are pushing Medicare for None, a scheme that would make it unlawful to provide the private health insurance policies that American families rely on and force everyone into a brandnew government scheme designed, of course, right here in Washington. It is ironic that this approach would mean long waiting lists for people with preexisting conditions and cause over 180 million Americans to lose the coverage they choose and rely on. Republicans are dedicated to protecting Americans with preexisting conditions. Republicans are the ones fighting for American families as they try to navigate the unaffordable wreckage of ObamaCare.

The story is the same on every issue: Democrats aren't interested in security and stability for American families;

they are interested in Washington redesigning middle-class Americans' lives from scratch so they can conform better to leftwing dreams.

Forty-plus—forty-plus—of our Democratic colleagues, including all of their Presidential candidates, could not even bring themselves to vote against the obviously absurd socialist wish list we considered yesterday. This is what the modern Democratic Party wants to be. These are their plans for the country. At least the American people are certainly offered a very, very clear contrast.

DISASTER FUNDING

Madam President, on an entirely different matter, in recent months, natural disasters have occupied an outsized share of headlines across our country. We have seen counties in Alabama and Georgia bear the blows of a vicious tornado, and we support the loved ones of those 23 people whose lives it claimed. We have seen a spate of powerful hurricanes tear across the shores of Florida and the Carolinas, leaving tens of billions of dollars in damage behind. Flooding has repeatedly caused damage in my home State of Kentucky, and, of course, it is currently at major disaster levels in communities across the Midwest.

In some places, the process of rebuilding has already dragged on for months. Families have faced the daily struggle of getting things back to normal.

Others are still literally—literally—underwater. Residents are wading through the wreckage of homes and businesses. Normal seems a long way away.

From the gulf coast to the heartland, there are Americans calling for our help. Here in Congress we must have their back. We must take swift and comprehensive action. I am pleased to say, a number of our colleagues have crafted legislation that would allow us to answer these calls for help from our people.

The supplemental funding measure advanced by the Senate yesterday would deliver over \$13 billion to help American communities recover and rebuild following recent natural disasters. It would mean more help for victims of tornadoes in our Southern States, victims of hurricanes from North Carolina to Puerto Rico, and the families in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, who are still, as we speak, waiting for the waters of a truly catastrophic flood to recede. The legislation before us would equip the Department of Defense to conduct urgent repairs to bases and installations damaged by storms. It would help America's farmers and ranchers cover storm-related losses, and it would help get local schools, healthcare facilities, and major infrastructure back on track more quickly.

I am proud of the work put in by many Members to prepare this latest package so swiftly and thoroughly on behalf of our communities in need. We

owe thanks to the leadership of Chairman SHELBY, along with the efforts of Senator PERDUE, Senator ISAKSON, Senator SCOTT, Senator RUBIO, and others who made this effort possible. Thanks to them, the Senate can take action soon on a comprehensive measure to support our fellow citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress and which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object. As I mentioned yesterday, when a similar unanimous consent proposal was propounded, I have consistently supported the proposition that the special counsel should be allowed to complete his work without interference, and I have consistently supported the proposition that his report ought to be released, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with the law and with the need to protect sources and methods and the need to preserve the integrity of ongoing investigations, including investigations the special counsel has referred to others.

The Attorney General has committed to as much transparency as possible in the release of the report, and he is working with the special counsel toward that end. I think we should be consistent in letting the special counsel actually finish his work and not just when we think it may be politically advantageous to one side or the other for him to do so.

Therefore, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to make remarks as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, last Friday, Special Counsel Mueller submitted his report to Attorney General Barr. On Sunday, the Attorney General provided a four-page summary of that report to Congress and the American people.

Unfortunately, the Attorney General's summary tells us little about what Special Counsel Mueller actually found. In fact, according to the summary, Mueller's office spent 2 years investigating, with a team of 19 lawyers and 40 FBI agents and other professional staff. The special counsel issued

more than 2,800 subpoenas, executed nearly 500 search warrants, obtained more than 230 orders for communication records, issued almost 50 orders authorizing the use of pen registers, made 13 requests to foreign governments for evidence, and interviewed approximately 500 witnesses. That is quite a record.

The fact is, a four-page summary cannot possibly illuminate what this thorough of an investigation uncovered. I find it so disappointing that so many are rushing to judgment without being able to see the full report or all of the underlying facts.

This report should be made public. As has been, I think, well stated, not only is the official government interested, but the American public is interested in our findings as well.

We know the Russian Government interfered with the U.S. election. That has been reported by the intelligence community and intelligence committee—I sit on that committee—and it has been reaffirmed by the special counsel's investigation.

We also know, from court filings, documents, and press reports, that the President and at least 17 people associated with his campaign had more than 100 contacts with Russia or Russia's intermediaries.

However, Attorney General Barr's summary provides no information about any of these contacts or multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the campaign, and that is a quote—"multiple offers from Russian-affiliated individuals to assist the campaign"—referenced in the Attorney General's summary.

Congress must determine the risks to national security, whether there was, in fact, misconduct, whether existing laws are sufficient to deter and punish election interference, and what next steps are appropriate. The American people also have a right to the truth about what happened in the 2016 election and to judge the facts for themselves.

Special Counsel Mueller also did not draw a conclusion, one way or the other, as to whether the President committed a crime through his efforts to obstruct the investigation. Instead, Mr. Mueller wrote: "While this report does not conclude that the President committed a crime, it also does not exonerate him."

Since Special Counsel Mueller elected to describe the facts but did not decide whether to charge the President with a crime, we don't know why he made this decision, but clearly we do need to see the facts for ourselves to be able to make a decision about how to proceed and what, if any, additional steps are necessary.

While the Attorney General concluded there was no crime of obstruction committed, we knew that was his conclusion 9 months ago when he wrote a 10-page memo explaining why the President can't be charged with obstruction of justice. Special Counsel

Mueller found that there is "evidence on both sides of the question." Congress and the American people should be able to see that evidence and make a determination, including what the appropriate next steps are, if any.

I am very disappointed that some Republicans are saying Democrats need to move on before we even see the report or underlying evidence. Many of these Republicans called for eight congressional investigations into the Benghazi attack and demanded and received 880,000 pages of documents related to the Clinton email investigation. We have also already obtained documents related to Mueller's investigation, including classified FISA Court applications.

Of course, unwarranted foot-dragging is really not good, and really bad for this country. I had thought we were past that with prior events where we did take action, and we were able to see both sides. After 37 indictments, 6 of whom were indicted Trump advisers, as well as 7 guilty pleas, surely spending more than a week on understanding what happened and asking for the full report is warranted. How can we have 37 indictments, 6 Trump advisers, as well as guilty pleas, without being able to understand what actually happened and not be afforded the material to gain that understanding?

I hope this can be a bipartisan effort to ensure the full record is produced and the facts are uncovered. It is really puzzling to me why the Republican side would not want to do this. Do they presume guilt on their side, and therefore they want to hide it from the public? If you don't, why wouldn't you want whatever the true facts are to come out? The American people deserve no less.

On March 14, the House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for Special Counsel Mueller's report to be made public. The vote was unanimous, 420 to 0—420 to 0. Both sides of the House of Representatives said this should happen.

Senator SCHUMER, our minority leader, has now twice sought unanimous consent for the Senate to consider that resolution. These requests have been blocked by Republicans. I don't understand that. If the House can consider this, why can't we look at what the House has done? This, to my knowledge, in the quarter of a century that I have been in this body, has never happened before, where the Senate has actually refused to look at information.

I very much hope there can be a change of mind and allow the U.S. Senate to do its due diligence in this matter. Hiding the information will not solve the problem.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, there is so much going on. So I will be addressing several topics today: healthcare, climate change, Mr. Mueller's report, and Puerto Rico.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, two nights ago, President Donald Trump and Attorney General Barr decided to escalate their 2-year war against healthcare to a whole new level. They declared that the entire Affordable Care Act, and the healthcare for tens of millions of Americans and protections for more than 100 million, is unconstitutional and ought to be eliminated.

Now, the President wants to go back to repeal and replace again? Make our day. The Republicans here in the Senate tried over and over to deal with repeal and replace. They couldn't because they have no replacement. The American people spoke loud and clear in the November 2018 elections and addressed the Republican antics by defeating them resoundingly. The American people resoundingly rejected the Republican plan of repeal and replace for healthcare. In fact, very few Republican Senators would embrace it when they were running as candidates.

Indeed, if the Republican Party wants to be, in Donald Trump's words, "the Party of healthcare," God help the middle class. God save the middle class. God save people with disabilities. God save the hundreds of millions with preexisting conditions.

If the administration had its way, the elimination of the Affordable Care Act would send premiums soaring for millions of Americans. It would revoke coverage for tens of millions more who gained coverage through Medicaid expansions. It would strike protections for hundreds of millions, even people who get coverage through their employer. It would tell college students and graduates aged 21 to 26 that they could no longer be on their parents' healthcare.

Let's not forget that this decision would impose billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs for seniors on Medicare. Does the Republican Party really want to raise the price for senior citizens when they buy drugs? That is what they are doing. That is what President Trump is doing. I wasn't at the lunch where the President talked about this, but I didn't hear any reports of any Republican in that room rejecting what the President said when he said repeal and replace. This Republican Party is the Party of healthcare? Come on, now.

You can't undo all the healthcare for tens of millions, the protections for preexisting conditions for hundreds of millions, the drug costs for tens of millions of seniors, the protections for millions of young college graduates,

and say you are for healthcare. You just can't.

Compounding the injury, the President's latest budget wants to cut more than \$1 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid. In doing so, the President is breaking his promise, blatantly and uncaringly. He doesn't care about what he promised people. He is breaking his promise to the American people that he would do no such thing. This is the party of healthcare? The Department of Justice's decision is a moral and institutional outrage. Not only would it harm Americans, but it would undermine the rule of law.

Today I am announcing a new plan—a new way for my colleagues to show that they mean what they say. I am introducing a simple amendment to the pending appropriations bill we are considering here in the Senate. It will very simply prohibit the Department of Justice from using any funding to litigate the downfall of ACA in the circuit court. Let's see how all of our Republican colleagues who said they don't want to take away protections for pre-existing conditions, who said they don't want to take away healthcare for millions, and who said they want to lower seniors' drug costs vote on this.

Will the leader do what he has been so characteristic of doing in the majority and block a chance for this amendment? Will any Republican on the other side stand up and say: Don't block it, Mr. Leader; we have to protect the American people's healthcare. We shall see.

My Republican friends, you are going to have the chance this afternoon or when they vote on this bill to show us which side you are on.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, the Senate finally held the Republican leader's promised political stunt vote on the issue of climate change and the results did not make the Republicans happy. The stunt was exposed for what it was. The whole issue of climate change—for the first time, really—was debated here and turned on our Republican colleagues. It became clear to the American people that our Republican colleagues have no plan for climate change.

We have heard what they are against. We haven't heard a peep about a comprehensive plan that they are for. The attempt by the Republicans to make a mockery of the issue completely backfired. Leader McConnell was forced to answer some questions that he has ducked for a very long time. Whether or not Leader McConnell intended it, the fact is, at the very least, that this Chamber is doing something it hasn't done in years. It held an actual debate on the topic of climate change.

McConnell's stunt, again, boomeranged on him and his colleagues, and they finally had to discuss this issue rather than do what they have liked to do for the last 5 years and sweep it under the rug.

Yesterday, the day before, today, and continuing in the future, we ask our

Republican colleagues three simple questions to which they owe an answer to their constituents. First, do you believe climate change is real? Second, do you believe climate change is caused by human activity? And third, do you believe Congress has to act immediately to deal with this problem?

We are finally getting some answers, thanks to McConnell's trick that he eventually played on himself. No less than Leader McConnell was asked by the press yesterday afternoon at his Ohio Clock press camp if he believes in climate change, and he said he believes it is real and he believes it is caused by human activity. Well, there is one more step if you believe all that: What is your answer—not what you are against but what you are for?

I want to commend Senators ROBERTS, ALEXANDER, and MURKOWSKI. They came to the floor and stated unequivocally and clearly that climate change is real and caused by humans. Make no mistake, in this glacial atmosphere controlled by the Republicans, when it comes to climate change, this is real progress, but, of course, it is not close to enough.

As to the third question, Leader McConnell offered no solution. All we got was a sham vote that he voted against. So I ask Leader McConnell: What is your plan? Some Republicans now seem to admit the challenges of climate change. OK, that is good. Now, what is your solution?

Turning the Senate floor into a campaign ad studio is not a solution to climate change, nor is it very effective even for their own purposes. Several Senators seemed to suggest that this problem can simply be solved by funding for more research. I support funding for research. It should be part of any climate plan. Yet I say to my friends—particularly, those from coal States—that is not going to solve the problem. Dealing with coal sequestration and coal technology will, at best, solve 1 percent of the problem. So I say to my friends: What about the other 99 percent, because 1 percent isn't enough? Temperatures will still go up. The oceans will still rise. The terrible kinds of disaster—flooding, tornadoes, and wildfires—that we have had will continue. To simply say that you are doing some research into how to deal with coal is not close to solving the problem.

Yesterday was a golden opportunity for this Chamber to come together and show the American people that Republicans are serious about tackling the threat. I asked to create a bipartisan select committee on climate change. Let's get some of the people who are most interested in this issue from different ideological stripes and from different places in the country to come together and come up with a solution. Of course, once again, the Republican leader blocked that genuine attempt. Unfortunately, my good friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming, objected when we asked for this. Instead,

the Senate wasted the American people's time on a ridiculous charade featuring a sham vote that fooled no one.

Read the press today. Read the Wall Street Journal. Yesterday's vote on the Republican version of the Green New Deal was not just a cynical ploy—although it was—it was the ultimate “tell” that Republicans, for all their talk, have no real plan to combat climate change, no real plan on healthcare, and no real plan on climate change—just a lot of political stunts.

I am glad that finally, though—this is the good news here—some of my colleagues are starting to see the light and admit that it is real and admit that it is caused by human activity. Now, they need to put their money where their mouth is and work with us to take action that matches the scale of the problem. If our colleagues refuse to join us on a bipartisan basis in creating this select committee, we Democrats aren't going to wait. We will take action on our own.

Later today, we will be announcing our own path. We are going on offense on climate change, keeping a spotlight on this issue and making sure that this Chamber keeps debating this most urgent issue of our day.

We cannot play politics with our children's future any longer. I have a new grandson. By the time he grows up, I don't want the waters to be rising, the climate to be changing, and the whole world totally discombobulated so he can't live a good and happy life. We should all feel that way.

Avoiding the problem, whether it is because special interests are saying to avoid it—the Koch brothers, coal industry, oil industry, and everyone else—is not serving our country well.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. President, the Republicans and the White House are refusing to make several minor changes to the disaster bill under consideration today—changes that will help Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

Puerto Rico was devastated by Hurricane Maria a year and a half ago—devastation we haven't probably seen in any other part of our country. It is reported that nearly \$91 billion of damage was done by the hurricane.

Puerto Rico is still struggling to recover. These are American citizens. Let's not forget that. These are not people from some foreign land. Yet it has been publicly reported that the President has told his staff to find ways to limit Federal dollars from going to Puerto Rico. It was even reported that at yesterday's lunch with Republicans, the President complained that Puerto Rico has been getting too much aid. He said he “doesn't want another single dollar going to the island,” even though he has held up the dollars that Democrats and Republicans voted for.

We help Americans when there is a disaster. We don't pick and choose because they may not vote for us—or

vote at all—or because we don't like the elected official. These are people who are hurting.

What the President is doing with Puerto Rico is disgraceful but typical of his view to divide and pick winners and losers. What the President is doing is unacceptable and un-American.

I urge my Republican colleagues to come to the table, to accept the commonsense changes we have proposed to help the territories recover—the same proposals that passed the House—and to help us pass a disaster package that addresses the needs not of some but of all disaster survivors and that addresses the needs of all Americans who are affected, not just those he happens to like. That is not what any President before has done. That is not what America does.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. President, finally, I want to say a few words on the report by Special Counsel Mueller.

From the start, the Democrats have argued that nothing short of full transparency will satisfy the American people's right to know what happened during Russia's attack on our election. That is why it is unacceptable that Mr. BARR, who reached his initial conclusions quickly—in 48 hours—now needs several weeks, he says, to review the report, and there are reports that he may now only release a summary of that finding.

First, let me talk about the time.

Attorney General Barr moved like a hare to get out the summary he wrote with the purpose of exonerating the President. He is now moving like a tortoise to issue Mueller's full report. People are going to ask: What the heck is going on? Is there some political motivation here? Americans are entitled to see the full report, not a summary.

We all know the intelligence community can redact parts of the report—small they will be—to protect secret sources, but we also expect the rest of the report to be issued, not a summary. Mr. BARR has issued one brief summary already, and many Americans don't trust that summary because they want to see the whole report before jumping to a conclusion. So we need the report now, without delay. We can't have political considerations enter into it. "Oh, we will delay it for several weeks to let things cool off." I hope that is not what is happening.

In any case, we need the report now. This is too important for Mr. BARR to be playing politics. He can remove any cloud of suspicion by releasing the full report as the President and members of his party call for. When we read reports that Barr only wants to release a summary and that Leader MCCONNELL is unsupportive of transparency, something doesn't smell right.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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 GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, the Senate voted on the Green New Deal—the Democrats' \$93 trillion socialist fantasy.

How did the Democrats vote on this deal? They voted present. That is right. There were 43 out of 47 Members of the Democratic caucus who voted present.

This may be the first time in my experience here that I have ever seen a piece of legislation and people who authored that legislation—in this case, there were 13 Democrats who authored the bill, cosponsored the bill, introduced the bill, and indicated that action on the issue needed to be taken now—proceed to vote present. I have never seen that in my time either in the House or in the Senate. There was always an opportunity, as the Presiding Officer knows, in the House of Representatives, when you voted by electronic machine, to punch the yellow "present" option. You had red or green or present, but very rarely was that used. Yet I don't think I have ever seen, in the U.S. Senate, 13 U.S. Senators file a bill, introduce a bill, cosponsor a bill, talk about how important it is that we deal with it and deal with it immediately, and then proceed to vote present. That is what happened yesterday.

I want to step back for a minute and talk about the Green New Deal—the Democrats' plan to put the government in charge of everything from your energy to your healthcare.

The costs of this plan would be staggeringly high. One think tank released its first estimate that found that the Green New Deal would cost somewhere between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over a 10-year period—between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion. The 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world—the whole planet—only came to \$80.7 trillion, which is more than \$10 trillion less than the Democrats are proposing to spend on the Green New Deal. This \$93 trillion is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history.

So how do the Democrats plan to cover that \$93 trillion? Well, they don't actually have a plan. The Green New Deal resolution itself makes a vague reference to "community grants, public banks, and other public financing."

Then, of course, the Democrats have their favorite funding source, which is taxing the rich. The problem is, there is no way taxing the rich would even come close to paying for the Green New Deal. One analyst found that three Democratic proposals—the New York Representative's proposed 70-percent top tax rate, the Massachusetts Senator's wealth tax, and the Hawaii Senator's financial transactions tax—would together pay for approximately 4 percent of the Green New Deal.

Taxing every millionaire in the United States at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would bring in only a tiny fraction of \$93 trillion. Taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years wouldn't get the Democrats anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Taxing every family making more than \$100,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would still leave the Democrats far short of \$93 trillion.

The Green New Deal is not a plan that can be paid for by taxing the rich. This plan would be paid for on the backs of working families. The size of the tax hikes that would be required to even begin to finance this massive government expansion would sharply diminish Americans' standard of living and usher in a new era of diminished prosperity, and I haven't even mentioned the freedom of choice Americans would lose and give up under the Green New Deal.

Your car's engine would likely soon become illegal. Washington planners could force you to rebuild your house to meet strict, new, energy-efficient guidelines. Your ability to travel by air might be restricted or entirely eliminated.

The Green New Deal doesn't limit itself to massive government expansion in the area of energy.

Among other things, it would also put the government in charge of your healthcare. So, if you like your health plan, get ready to give it up. Then there are the millions of current energy jobs that would be lost under this plan. Plus, there would likely be significant job losses in other industries as small businesses and larger companies would find themselves being unable to cope with the Green New Deal's mandates and taxes.

For American families, the Green New Deal would mean smaller paychecks, fewer jobs, fewer choices, and a permanently reduced standard of living.

You don't even have to take my word for it. Here is what the AFL-CIO, which represents 12½ million workers in a number of unions, had to say about the Green New Deal:

The Green New Deal resolution is far too short on specific solutions that speak to the jobs of our members and the critical sectors of our economy. It is not rooted in an engineering-based approach and makes promises that are not achievable or realistic. We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living go unanswered.

Let me repeat that:

We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living go unanswered.

Again, these are quotes from the AFL-CIO. That is what it is saying about the Democrats' Green New Deal.

The American people have a right to know where the Democrats stand on

this massive government expansion. Are they for it or are they against it? Their Presidential candidates have embraced this plan. There were 13 Senate Democrats, as I mentioned, who sponsored the original Green New Deal resolution in the Senate, and there were 92 Democrats who sponsored the original Green New Deal resolution in the House. Yet, yesterday, just four Members of the Democratic caucus had the courage to make their positions clear.

As for the rest, well, it is actually understandable that most Democrats didn't want to go on the record as supporting, perhaps, the most irresponsible and costly resolution ever to come before the U.S. Senate. It is pretty difficult to tell your constituents that you support cutting their paychecks, eliminating millions of their jobs, and drastically reducing their choices.

I am sure there are more than four Members of the Democratic caucus who don't support this plan, but the Democrats are more and more enthralled with the far-left wing of their party, and, clearly, some Democrats were afraid to actually reject this plan with their votes.

So what happened? There were 43 out of 47 Members of the Democratic caucus here in the U.S. Senate who left the American people in limbo about their views, and they ended up voting present.

I would love to think that every Democrat who voted present yesterday has realized how damaging the Green New Deal would be to working families. But the scary truth is that while some Democrats may have voted present simply because they wanted to avoid angering the far-left wing of their party, other Democrats really believe—they really believe—in the Green New Deal.

The junior Senator from Vermont was asked if the Green New Deal goes too far. His answer? "No. You cannot go too far on the issue of climate change."

Really? You can't go too far? Not even if you saddle millions of families with exorbitant taxes and other costs just for miniscule gains? Not even if you permanently damage the American economy?

One of the Green New Deal's authors has actually stated that it is a legitimate question whether people should have children because of climate change. Is that something the Green New Deal supporters want to legislate too? Really?

The Democrats' Green New Deal extremism is disturbing, and I am deeply disappointed in yesterday's vote because the American people deserve to hear where every Democrat stands on this dangerous plan. Americans deserve to know whether Democrats are willing to hike their taxes, eliminate their jobs, and diminish drastically their freedoms.

I hope more Democrats will join the four who rejected this massive govern-

ment overreach and will work with Republicans to develop responsible solutions to protect our environment—solutions that don't hurt American families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CELEBRATING VAISAKHI

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a very special day for the Sikh religion and the Sikh community across America and in Pennsylvania—and this is the holiday of Vaisakhi.

Although the youngest among the major religions of the world, Sikhism has emerged as a distinct socio-religious community. By the numbers, it is, I believe, the sixth largest religion in the world, with 30 million adherents worldwide, and approximately 700,000 Sikhs have chosen to make their home in the United States.

A large number of those Sikhs live in my State of Pennsylvania. In fact, there are several Sikh places of worship across Pennsylvania. They are known as a Gurdwara, and they are located in and around Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Allentown, and Erie.

Sikhism itself was founded in the 15th century in South Asia on the principles of equality, justice, and respect for all human beings.

Sikhs pray twice a day—in the morning and in the evening—and they pray for the welfare of mankind.

Over a period of 239 years, Sikhism was established by 10 gurus. The first among them was Guru Nanak. These gurus were learned, spiritual guides devoted to improving the moral well-being of their followers and the communities in which they lived.

In 1699, the 10th and final guru—Gobind Singh—founded a fellowship of soldier saints called the Khalsa Panth. Today, Sikhs celebrate this occasion with the holiday that they call Vaisakhi. This year, Sikhs across the United States and around the world will celebrate Vaisakhi on April 14.

For Sikhs, Vaisakhi is a very special time. It is a special time to celebrate and share their faith with their friends and their neighbors. The occasion is marked by dancing and parades. Everyone is welcome to attend these celebrations, and they attract Americans from all religious, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds.

Vaisakhi celebrations are a really vibrant affair, and members of the Sikh community wear bright orange or yellow festive clothes to mark the occasion. These colors represent the spirit and the joy of the celebration.

It is interesting to note that when Vaisakhi is celebrated in the Sikh homeland of Punjab, the gold and yellow wheat fields are ready to be harvested.

This year, the Sikh Coordination Committee East Coast has organized a parade in Washington, DC, on April 6 to commemorate Vaisakhi as National Sikh Day. The theme of the parade is

Sikh identity, Sikh culture, and the Sikh way of life. Thousands of Sikhs from all over the United States will be here participating and celebrating.

I came here this morning because I want to add my voice as one wishing the Sikh community great luck and great joy at this parade and in the very joyous celebration of Vaisakhi.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate had a significant vote. Senators made their voices heard on the Green New Deal, and after a lot of grandstanding from those Senate Democrats who initially rushed to support this proposal, not a single one voted for the proposal.

However, my Republican colleagues and I didn't vote present. We don't believe that is what our constituents sent us here to do. Instead, we voted against the socialist grab bag of policies that would set us back an estimated \$93 trillion and would bankrupt the State of Texas. To be clear, voting no on the Green New Deal isn't a referendum on the issue of lowering carbon emissions or finding cleaner energy; it is saying no to the litany of far-left proposals that would leave American families footing the bill to the tune of tens of thousands of dollars each.

The Green New Deal promised things like free higher education. You might have thought this was really about the environment; well, it was a grab bag of government handouts and takeovers. It also included Medicare for All, which means that if you have employer-provided health insurance, you couldn't keep it. Even President Obama said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. But not now—not with this new, radical group of Democrats who now say: Forget that promise. We are going to take what you have, even if you like it.

There, of course, was the guarantee of jobs. I noted yesterday that the only thing missing from the Green New Deal is free beer and pizza for everybody.

It has been estimated that implementing the full list of the Green New Deal's promises would cost the average American family \$65,000 a year, which is well over what many Americans make annually.

These ludicrous proposals were pitched as a way to uplift the middle class and create jobs, but in reality, they would have undone the economic gains we made these past 2 years under the Trump administration. We could say goodbye to the record-low unemployment levels and the growth we have been seeing. What middle-class American do you know who could afford an extra \$65,000 each year to pay the Federal Government for the litany of Green New Deal line items, such as tearing down every building and replacing it with a green version?

Even the liberal AFL-CIO's energy committee had this to say:

We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living to go unanswered.

This is the AFL-CIO.

Instead of the Green New Deal, we should follow the Texas model of innovation. But it is not just Texas; there are some great private sector initiatives taking place that deal with this concern about CO₂ emissions in a much more practical, rational, free market way. We have a thriving energy sector in Texas, as the Presiding Officer knows, and it isn't stifled by overregulation. That is one reason it is thriving.

The Green New Deal would force us to rely on foreign energy sources because we wouldn't be able to produce enough here in the United States to keep the lights on. But with investment in innovative solutions and new technologies, we can ensure that our country can remain energy independent and deal with legitimate concerns about the environment.

I applaud our colleagues who voted against this legislation to ensure that the American people won't have to pick up the tab for the far-left wing agenda of our Democratic colleagues. Conversely, I stand ready to work on real, achievable solutions and to find ways to reduce emissions and lessen our environmental footprint without overregulating and overcharging.

DEER PARK, TEXAS

On another note, most people across the country hadn't heard of Deer Park, TX, until last Sunday. They were probably more familiar with nearby Houston, TX. But last Sunday morning was when the first reports came rolling out that residents were forced to shelter in place when a chemical tank at the Intercontinental Terminals Company, or ITC, caught fire.

ITC's tanks hold petrochemical liquids and gases used to produce gasoline—all highly flammable and hazardous. As many could have predicted, but certainly no one had hoped, the fire spread quickly to a nearby tank. By Wednesday, seven tanks were aflame. Firefighters fought for 3 days to extinguish the massive flames, and just when it seemed as if the fire was under control, it flared again last Friday, burning through 11 storage tanks in total. A massive fireball and billowing plumes of smoke could be seen for miles. This didn't stop, as new tanks caught fire, forcing schools and businesses to close and residents to rightfully question their safety.

Unfortunately, the story doesn't end there. By the end of the week, as ITC drained chemicals from the remaining exposed tanks, the containment wall surrounding the tank farm burst. Foam used to fight the fires and contaminants leaked, forcing a portion of the Houston Ship Channel to close and bringing a new round of health risks associated with the release of airborne and liquid toxins.

Earlier this week, officials from ITC said that cleanup crews had removed more than 33,000 barrels of an oily mixture from the ship channel. That is 1 million gallons, which is more than I can even imagine.

The chemical fire and resulting chemical spill not only brought grave health concerns to those who live and work around Deer Park and pollution to the air and environment, it also ground businesses in the region to a halt. Because of the chemical spill, nearly 7 miles of the Houston Ship Channel closed for 3 days, cutting off this booming area of our economy from the waterway and delaying shipment of goods up and down the ship channel. Some estimates show that the region's oil and gas and petrochemical sectors lost \$1 billion in revenue as a result of the closure. This ship channel sees hundreds of shipments a day, with tankers and freighters moving various products and goods up and down the shoreline to businesses surrounding the Houston area.

The effects from the closure of facilities and companies in the area will require a costly and lengthy recovery. Folks along the ship channel in Southeast Houston will also be concerned about health consequences until we can find out more answers.

The ITC's tanks contain chemicals commonly used in the production of gasoline—xylene, naphtha, pyrolysis gasoline. Naphtha, in particular, can irritate and burn the nose and throat when inhaled. When exposed to fire, naphtha can produce poisonous gases. The health effects of these chemicals are of grave concern, but it is not just the short-term effects—the irritation and burning—that are concerning; contact with these chemicals can potentially have lasting, long-term effects, making it vital to discern the exact level of exposure to these chemicals caused as a result of the fire.

It is important that we get to the bottom of this, and I am proud that our local, State, and Federal officials have quickly jumped into action. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, local responders, and the Coast Guard were all on the scene quickly and have been working around the clock since the start of the first fire. The U.S. Chemical Safety Board and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or OSHA, have opened investigations into the fires. The Environmental Protection Agency, along with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, are conducting continuous air quality checks.

I appreciate the swift action by local, State, and Federal agencies to protect my constituents in the region and conduct investigations to ensure that we can prevent this type of event from ever occurring again. I will monitor those investigations closely as they progress and will ensure they have the resources they need in order to complete their work.

Sometimes when people hear us talk about regulation, they act as if our side of the aisle believes that no regulation is appropriate, which is entirely false. It is important to have regulations to protect the public safety of the American people and particularly in places around tank farms like this one in Deer Park. I think it is very important that any existing regulations—that we make sure those regulations and laws are enforced.

As part of this investigation, I hope we will find out that there were no violations of existing regulations and laws, but if there were, then the people responsible should be held accountable. I am not going to prejudge at this early point before the investigation takes place whether there is any legal responsibility or whether anybody did things they should not have done consistent with the laws and regulations that do exist, but I will say that once the investigation is complete, if there were violations of regulations designed to protect the public safety or laws passed by Congress and signed by the President, that I will be the first to demand there be accountability for violation of those regulations and those laws.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). 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.

H.R. 268

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 16, more than 2 months ago, the House passed a supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 268, which addressed the needs of all communities impacted by recent natural disasters. The House-passed disaster bill provided assistance to help people impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, the Hawaii volcanoes, and the California wildfires. It provided aid to the people in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Guam, who were struck last year by typhoons, and the people of American Samoa, who were devastated by Cyclone Gita. It continued assistance for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands to help them continue their recovery from Hurricanes Irma and Maria. They passed it 2 months ago.

Instead of moving quickly on this package to help those Americans in need, Senate Republicans, at the President's insistence, held up the House bill because it included assistance for Americans in Puerto Rico. Instead of giving aid to the people who need it, the President has chosen to delay it over petty grudges and political concerns.

The President's refusal to help Americans in Puerto Rico not only delays the important disaster bill that many of the other States are relying on to

speed their recovery efforts, it discriminates against the over 3 million Americans who reside in Puerto Rico, and that is wrong. We have never—certainly in my years here—had disaster bills in which we say that Americans in this State can be helped, but we do not like the Americans in this State, so they cannot be helped.

This is the United States of America. We are supposed to take care of all of our citizens when there is a crisis, not pick and choose who gets assistance based on who we are aligned with politically. I have voted for disaster relief for red States, for blue States, for purple States because they are part of the United States of America. I feel that as a country we have to come together to help each other when there is a disaster.

Certainly Republican Senators and Democratic Senators helped the State of Vermont when we were hit with a disaster a few years ago. Well, today it is Puerto Rico, and all of the Americans in Puerto Rico need our help.

A year and a half ago, it was hit by two back-to-back category 5 hurricanes. It is rare that anybody ever gets hit by two back-to-back category 5 hurricanes. An estimated 2,975 Americans lost their lives. Homes were demolished, communities destroyed. It was an extraordinary disaster, and it requires a commensurate extraordinary response.

I am glad we are finally moving to debate on the House-passed bill because we need that. We actually ought to just pass the House-passed bill, but, unfortunately, the Republicans say they will file a substitute that will take us backward, not forward.

Again, at the President's insistence, it eliminates critical assistance for the Americans in Puerto Rico provided for in the House bill, as well as assistance to other U.S. territories. It eliminates State-revolving funds that would help Puerto Rico rebuild damaged water systems and ensure they are resilient and can stand up to future storms. It eliminates a 100-percent cost-share for FEMA that would help cash-strapped Puerto Rico access Federal aid. It eliminates money to help Americans ensure that Puerto Rico is able to rebuild their electrical grid. It eliminates \$68 million in Medicaid assistance for American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands, whose programs face serious shortages due to the increased need.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle claim that this money is not needed. They point to previous disaster supplemental bills and argue that we have already addressed the needs of Puerto Rico, and we should move on. Well, that is untrue. We provided Puerto Rico with significant assistance, as we should have, given the extraordinary nature of the storms that ravaged the island and given the extent of the devastation, but as damage assessments come in and the full picture of the devastation becomes clear, we

must continually reassess and provide them what is needed to fully recover.

I remember when this first happened, back when the White House was saying there may be two or three or four or a dozen fatalities in Puerto Rico. Well, they were off by thousands. There were 2,975 people who lost their lives, not just a handful.

We don't simply appropriate the same amount of money to each State or territory that is hit with a disaster no matter the level of damage. We look at each place, and we provide what is needed for the people to rebuild their homes, their communities, and their lives.

I will give you one example of why one size does not fit all. With Katrina, we in Congress passed six supplemental disaster packages—not one, six—to help rebuild Louisiana and Mississippi because the storm was unlike anything we had ever seen. They needed the assistance coming in over time. I supported the help for Louisiana and Mississippi. No one at the time would have argued to stop after the first tranche of funding we provided and then leave them to fend for themselves, because they are Americans. We saw there were more problems, and we added money.

This is no different.

The President reportedly came to the Capitol and met with Senators yesterday and made his case as to why we should not continue aid to Puerto Rico. Let me repeat. The President of the United States—something I have never seen in my 45 years here with either a Republican or Democratic President—affirmatively argued that we should refrain from helping American citizens in need.

Of course, like so many things the President has said, it was not based in fact or reality. He claimed that Puerto Rico had received over \$90 billion in Federal assistance, but it has not. He knows it has not. Why does he keep saying this when he has to know that what he is saying is not true? He claims it is using Federal money to pay off its debt. It has not. The President knows that is not true. Why does he keep saying it?

Some here in this body have claimed that Puerto Rico has in the bank \$20 billion in previously appropriated money that they have failed to spend, and they argue that we should provide no more until it is drawn down. I do not know if they are getting their talking points from the White House or what, but that is simply false.

The bulk of the money to which they refer, which we Republicans and Democrats alike voted to appropriate over 1 year ago, is being held up by the administration in redtape and bureaucracy. It seems as though it is being purposely held back because of inaction by this administration. Billions of dollars that Congress approved over 1 year ago for disaster recovery efforts remain in the U.S. Treasury in Washington, DC, not where they belong—assisting the American citizens of Puerto Rico. There is no excuse for that.

They cannot have it both ways. The administration cannot simultaneously hold up recovery dollars for Puerto Rico and then point to Puerto Rico's failure to spend it as an excuse not to provide additional assistance. In other words, they are holding these billions away from Puerto Rico, saying: You cannot have it, but why are you not spending it?

Come on. You cannot do that. You cannot claim they are not spending the money that is being held back from them, and then say that is why they do not need additional assistance.

Yesterday, Senator SCHUMER and I sent a letter to the administration about these bureaucratic delays and demanded answers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated March 25, 2019, to Mick Mulvaney, Peter Gaynor, and Ben Carson.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, March 25, 2019.

Hon. MICK MULVANEY,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PETER GAYNOR,
Acting Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC.

Hon. BEN CARSON,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR MULVANEY, HONORABLE GAYNOR, AND HONORABLE CARSON, Last November, we wrote to express our concern about the significant and unsupported delays related to the immediate and long-term recovery needs of Puerto Rico in the aftermath of catastrophic Hurricanes Irma and Maria. Specifically, we highlighted the lack of effective Federal interagency coordination under the leadership of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which has and continues to impede on the Commonwealth's ability to finalize emergency repairs through FEMA's Public Assistance categories A and B programs, and subsequently its efforts to move toward permanent reconstruction. These delays are not unique to FEMA, as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has also been affected by OMB's micromanagement and excessive bureaucracy as they attempt to administer and oversee Puerto Rico's Community Development Block Grant—Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) funding. The lack of leadership and coordination, combined with delays in meeting the basic needs of the island, more than eighteen months after receiving a presidential disaster declaration, has left far too many children and elderly citizens in unhealthy and unsafe conditions, families in severely damaged homes, and communities without adequate infrastructure to sustain a decent quality of life.

The response that we received, several months later, was wholly inadequate and contained no information to respond to our concerns. Specifically, we raised concerns about OMB's failure to work expeditiously with HUD to finalize and issue a Federal Register Notice for nearly \$16 billion in CDBG-DR mitigation funding that Congress appropriated in February 2018, of which \$8.3 billion has been allocated to Puerto Rico. As a result, this critical source of funding remains unavailable for obligation more than a year after it was appropriated, and nearly

a year and half after the historic hurricanes made landfall. The purpose of the mitigation allocation was to provide not only Puerto Rico, but more than 15 other cities, states and territories the resources necessary to rebuild their homes, businesses, and critical infrastructure to updated construction standards in order to prevent the same level of destruction in future disaster events. As you are probably aware, some reconstruction has started to take place, but without the availability of the mitigation funding, Puerto Rico is unable to strategically adopt these improved standards, or leverage this critical resource toward a comprehensive island-wide rebuild strategy. Further delays in the availability of funding is unacceptable. We insist that you finalize the mitigation notice in the next 30 days.

It has also come to our attention that several issues have reached a critical point with FEMA that are hindering the recovery efforts in Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands as well. FEMA needs to work with the territories to develop ways to expedite approvals and obligations of funding, especially for priority projects. In addition, FEMA needs to develop clear policies with regard to the issues laid out below, share them openly with Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, and Congress, and ensure that they are being implemented in a consistent way.

First, finalizing the consistent implementation of the “pre-disaster condition” language from section 20601 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 is paramount. The intent of this provision was to facilitate the rebuilding of infrastructure, including the electric grid, in a way that is resilient to future weather events, reduces the need for future federal disaster assistance, and makes use of technology and modern standards when rebuilding. Congress specifically wished to avoid a situation where the islands would be forced to simply plug new pieces into antiquated infrastructure, which would only lead to more frequent failures in the future. It has come to our attention that there is a lack of consistency and transparency in the way that FEMA is implementing this language, and that FEMA’s interpretation of this language may be contrary to congressional intent. For example, recent news reports indicate that FEMA has reduced its cost estimate for a Project Worksheet covering rebuilding of a number of schools because upgrades to meet industry standards were removed from the scope of work, after previously being discussed by the stakeholders involved. FEMA must immediately rectify this situation and issue clear guidance and expectations on its approach to implementing both the “pre-disaster condition” and the “industry standards” portion of the Bipartisan Budget Act. If FEMA needs additional guidance from Congress, we must be informed of this need immediately.

Second, we are also concerned about changing FEMA guidance and approaches leading to substantial replication of efforts and excessive delays in approving and obligating funding for priority projects in the territories. For example, according to representatives of the Commonwealth, in March of 2018 FEMA determined that the level of damage to the Vieques Hospital justified replacement of the building, instead of repair. Accordingly, in August of 2018, a scope of work was agreed upon by the stakeholders involved, and coordination between FEMA, COR3, and the municipality began on the cost estimate of the replacement project. However, two months later, FEMA representatives informed COR3 and the municipality that they intended to review the validity of the replacement decision that FEMA had previously made, sending the agreed upon decision to the Expert Panel for

their review. A year after the initial decision to replace the building was made, the fate of the Vieques Hospital project remains in question, and it appears that no real progress has been made in addressing the long-term health care needs of the people of Vieques, who continue to rely on a mobile clinic.

Last, when FEMA provides disaster assistance, the receiving State or Territory is responsible for implementing financial controls to ensure that funds obligated for a project by FEMA are drawn down by the grantee for the approved purpose. Currently, FEMA applies additional fiscal oversight requirements specifically to Puerto Rico, which require the Commonwealth to provide detailed documentation to validate that any costs incurred with disaster assistance funding are for allowable expenses. FEMA manually validates a percentage of those actions. Negotiations to end these additional oversight measures and expedite the processing of recovery funding have been ongoing; however, it’s unclear what remaining steps Puerto Rico must take to assume full responsibility of their recovery assistance. Until FEMA approves the transition of fiscal oversight to Puerto Rico, these extraordinary measures will stay in place. FEMA must be clear about the changes Puerto Rico needs to make in order to properly manage its own recovery expenses and eliminate any unnecessary bureaucratic steps.

As the territories continue to recover, it is crucial that FEMA address these issues and move forward with a stronger sense of urgency and consideration for the unique issues that they face. A recovery of this scale requires consistency, transparency, and constant coordination with territory officials.

Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands were hit by back-to-back Category 5 hurricanes, and the damage to the islands was catastrophic. An estimated 2,975 people lost their lives, homes were demolished, and communities destroyed. This extraordinary disaster requires a commensurate extraordinary response. We have a responsibility to come to the aid of fellow U.S. citizens in times of need, and this is certainly one of those times.

We ask for a detailed response providing an update on the status of these issues and the projected timeframe for their final resolution be provided without delay. Please respond by April 5, 2019.

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senator.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the inspector general of the Department of Housing and Urban Development announced that it will review whether the White House has deliberately interfered with the timely distribution of hurricane funds to Puerto Rico. That is pretty amazing. I have never seen a case that I remember where the inspector general of Housing and Urban Development had to look into whether the White House was deliberately interfering with funds to go to a disaster area.

I know firsthand what it is like to see a State hit by disaster. Tropical Storm Irene hit Vermont in 2011, and it devastated our State. People lost their homes, roads were washed out, bridges destroyed, and communities forever changed. I saw bridges twisted like a child’s toy. I saw farmhouses that had

been on the north side of the river, which were now on the south side of the river, upside down and destroyed. I saw farmers’ fields wiped out, businesses ruined, schools destroyed, roads necessary to bring medical supplies into villages gone. I know firsthand. I know as a lifelong Vermonter that in these moments the Federal Government is a critical partner in the effort to recover and rebuild.

It is the same in other States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Texas, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands. They are all counting on us to get this bill across the finish line.

That is why, 3 weeks ago, I put a compromise on the table to create a path forward. I did it in my capacity as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. It was a reasonable proposal. It does not restore everything that had been eliminated from the House bill, but it was a compromise that focused on the most critical proposals and the immediate needs. Had Senate Republicans accepted this proposal, we likely would have seen quick passage of a disaster bill in a bipartisan fashion in both the Senate and the House. It actually would have eliminated the need for a conference and would have gotten the assistance to the people who need it sooner rather than later.

Unfortunately, it appears the President will not accept even this reasonable offer. It makes me think about when he closed down the government for over 1 month because the Congress gave him only \$1.6 billion for a wall, and then he reopened the government when we gave him \$1.3 billion. I don’t know if they actually read the proposals and bills that we sent.

In this case, I think it is obvious what is happening. The President is willing to endanger the entire disaster package for all of the United States because he wants to pick winners and losers. When there is a disaster, there are no winners and losers. Americans come together to help everybody. Yet he wants to say who gets assistance in the wake of disasters based on his own arbitrary standards and political grudges. That is unacceptable. Where is it going to end? Which State will the President disfavor next? Remember that just a few months ago, the President, in a tweet, threatened to cut off aid to California as they were reeling from some of the worst fires in recent history. He sent a tweet telling millions of Americans he doesn’t want to help. We are an independent branch of government. We have to have a responsible party in the room, and it should be Congress.

I think back to when Vermont was hit by disaster and hurricane flooding. As I was traveling around the State the day after, surveying the damage, I was receiving emails from a number of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, saying: Vermont stood with us when we had a disaster; we will stand with you today.

That is what I want to do. I want to help, just as I voted to help Louisiana six times and Mississippi for their damage. It wasn't for a political benefit for Vermont, but it was because we are Americans and we all stand together.

To think that we might consider a disaster package that picks and chooses which Americans are helped when they have all suffered equally from disasters, and to say: OK, you, American, we favor you, you get money. You, American, I don't like you. So you are not going to get money. That is not the American way. That is not the way the Senate should be.

Let's pass a bill that addresses the needs of all communities impacted by disaster and do it now. People are waiting. The needs are pressing.

I will file an amendment today with my recommended compromise. It provides a reasonable path forward—one that allows us to move quickly to get assistance to the people who need it now. I hope all Members will support it.

The Governor of Puerto Rico made a strong statement this morning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Puerto Rico Governor Ricardo Rossello.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PUERTO RICO GOVERNOR
RICARDO ROSSELLÓ
(March 26, 2019)

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—“The comments attributed to Donald Trump today by senators from his own party are below the dignity of a sitting President of the United States. They continue to lack empathy, are irresponsible, regrettable and, above all, unjustified.

“I want to be very clear: Not a single federal dollar has been used to make debt payments. This has been the most transparent recovery in the history of the United States, providing unprecedented access and collaboration with federal agencies. In fact, just yesterday we reached an agreement with FEMA on the transition of responsibilities for the reimbursement of recovery funds. An agreement predicated on the acknowledgment by the federal government that appropriate fiscal controls are in fact established.

“I can only assume that Trump is receiving misleading information from his own staff. I have now made several requests to meet with the President to discuss Puerto Rico's recovery and reconstruction, but up to this day we haven't received a confirmation or a date, even though Trump told me we would meet after his visit to Vietnam earlier this year.

“I invite the President to stop listening to ignorant and completely wrong advice. Instead he should come to Puerto Rico to hear firsthand from the people on the ground. I invite him to put all of the resources at his disposal to help Americans in Puerto Rico, like he did for Texas and Alabama. No more, no less.

“Of course, today the world knows the unpleasant truth that Puerto Rico is a colonial territory of the United States and are well aware of the democratic deficiencies we endure: We are not allowed to vote for our President nor have voting representation in Congress. Even as we have asked democrat-

ically for statehood twice in the past seven years, the federal government has delayed their responsibility to act.

People from all over the nation, and the world, have witnessed the inequalities Americans face on the island. The federal response and its treatment during these past months in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria is clear evidence of our second-class citizenship.

“Mr. President: Enough with the insults and demeaning mischaracterizations. We are not your political adversaries; we are your citizens.

“We are not asking for anything more than any other U.S. state has received. We are merely asking for equality.”

MR. LEAHY. The Americans in Puerto Rico do not have representation in this body. Vermont is probably as far away from Puerto Rico as just about any State, with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii. They do not have anybody to speak directly on their behalf on such an important matter. The Governor has spoken out. I urge every Member to read what the Governor has to say. I agree with him. Americans in Puerto Rico should be helped just as Americans in Texas, Americans in Oklahoma, Americans in California, or Americans in New York, or wherever disaster has struck. We are the United States of America. Let's start acting like that on behalf of all Americans, not on behalf of political biases.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

MS. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join again my colleagues to speak of the need for bipartisan action to address climate warming.

Throughout the past year, we have received warning after warning about the warming and about the devastating consequences of climate change that are coming much sooner than some people actually expected.

I remember when I first got to the Senate. I was part of the Environment Committee, and we had military leaders come to speak. We had scientists, and they basically predicted everything that we have seen coming, from the wildfires in the West to the rising ocean levels, to weird weather events like more tornadoes, to the type of flooding that we are seeing in the Midwest as we speak and the type of flooding we have seen in Florida as a result of hurricanes.

They also talked about the economic consequences of this. I think it is really important that people don't see this as environment versus economics. If we do nothing, the economics are bad. If we do nothing, we are going to continue to see homeowners' insurance increase, like we have nationwide—a 50-percent increase in the last 10 years.

If we do something and we do it right and we do it smartly, we are going to see a bunch of new jobs in the field of green energy. We are going to see more solar. We are going to see more wind. We are going to see a whole new industry of an electric grid and things that we need to do to bring down greenhouse gases and be a leader once again in energy for the world.

Last October, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued a special report explaining the potential impact of climate change if the Earth warms 1.5 degrees Celsius above historic global temperature levels dating back to before the Industrial Revolution started. That report predicted that in just over 20 years, we could see even more of what we have seen this last year: persistent drought, food shortages, worsening wildfires, and increased flooding—damage that could cost an estimated \$54 trillion.

Then, in November, the “Fourth National Climate Assessment” issued a special report that concluded that without significant global efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, climate change will threaten the health and safety of people, will slow economic growth, will damage our Nation's infrastructure, which we are seeing right now in the Midwest, and will impede the production of energy and food.

Finally, in January of this year, the U.S. Department of Defense released a report on the effects of a changing climate to U.S. military installations and their operational viability. All of these experts—yes, scientists, and, yes, military leaders—have made it clear that inaction is not an option for our economy, for our environment, for our country, or for our world.

Military and security experts have repeatedly reminded us that climate change is a threat to our national security. Look at the examples of refugees coming up from Africa—people who used to be subsistence farmers who no longer can make their livings. They used to eek by, which was not easy, but now they are moving up; they are moving to Europe. That is just one example of what we are seeing.

I am from a State of refugees. Our refugees are a major part of our economy, but we know we want to have a sensible refugee policy and that we can't have sudden droves of people moving up because of environmental catastrophes that are going on in their countries. Yet we are going to see more and more and more of that. At some point, we have to realize, you know what, we want thriving economies in Africa; we want thriving economies throughout the world; and climate change is going to be an impediment to that.

If you want to close your eyes to the rest of the world and pretend it is not happening, it is going to come knocking at your door. It is what is going to keep happening if we don't do something about climate change. There will

be more severe weather—heat waves that could reduce our water supply, extreme rainfall that could damage critical infrastructure, a decrease in agricultural productivity that could threaten, in my State alone, a \$20 billion ag industry, which ranks fifth in the Nation. We cannot close our eyes to climate change because it is happening right now around us.

That is why it is all the more disappointing that the Senate has failed to seriously consider legislation that would address climate change. I have been here for these close calls. When I first came to the Senate, we were so close to getting a renewable electricity standard put in place nationwide. I had a bill that would have done that. It would have been combined with the renewable fuel standard, and I think it would have been a good way to have brought people in from both parties, from both sides of the aisle, and from all parts of the country. I remember standing in the back of this Chamber with Senator CANTWELL, bemoaning the fact that we were just one vote short of getting it done. That was over a decade ago.

Meanwhile, yes, States are taking action. With our having a Republican Governor at the time, Tim Pawlenty, my State was able to get a renewable electricity standard put in place—something like 20 to 25 percent by 2025—and we are making that. We wouldn't have made it if we had not set a goal, which, at that time, seemed bold, and we did it on a bipartisan basis—with Democrats, Republicans, and the legislature. We combined it politically with a renewable fuel standard so it would get some of our farmers and other people on board. We had two provisions in there—a strong renewable electricity standard and a strong renewable fuel standard, with a Republican Governor leading the way. Why? We could see ahead. We could see the effect climate change would have on our outdoor economy. We could see the effect it would have on hunting and fishing and recreation in our State.

Here is what happened. We barely missed doing something on the renewable electricity standard. Then President Obama got elected, and we were in the middle of a downturn. I had actually hoped we would have moved on renewable electricity, but the decision was made to go with cap and trade. I supported cap and trade. In the end, despite its passing in the House, we couldn't get the votes in the Senate, in part, because we were in the middle of a downturn.

Since then, we have done a few things on energy efficiency, which have been good, that Secretary Chu called the low-hanging fruit. We have done some things in the farm bill with conservation, with the sodbuster provision that I have with Senator THUNE, but we haven't done anything that significantly makes a difference.

Instead, the administration has taken us out of the international cli-

mate change agreement, which means we are the only country in the world that isn't in it. When the President first made his announcement, Syria and Nicaragua were not in it. Now they are. This is not what leadership is when we are the only country that is not part of this agreement. No, that is not what leadership is, and it certainly impedes our doing business around the world when it comes to green energy.

Other countries can go in there and ask: Why are you going to do business with this country? It is the only one that hasn't signed on to the international climate change agreement? That happens. I have heard from businesspeople. That happens. That is one thing that happens.

When it came to greenhouse gases, the standards we had in place at the EPA were a compromise that had been worked on over years. It is now on the cutting room floor because this administration went backward.

The gas mileage standard is something else we could do. Again, we went backward. Instead of working on these things—coming up with more comprehensive legislation—unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle decided, yesterday, to play politics by bringing up the Green New Deal resolution with the explicit intention of trying to create a divide by voting it down.

Do you know what? The resolution, as I have said, is aspirational. It sets out some audacious goals. We know we can't meet everything that is in that resolution in 10 years. Yet what has it done that I think is so good? It has reignited the debate on how the United States can lead the way in addressing global climate change while building a clean energy future that benefits American businesses, factories, and workers.

We are a country that sets audacious goals. We put a man on the Moon, right? We won World War II. We are a country that sets audacious goals. Sometimes it takes us longer to meet them, which is OK. If we see a problem, we don't just put our heads down. We look ahead; we look at each other; and we figure out how we are going to meet the challenge. That is what we have to do with climate change.

At the same time that our Republican colleagues brought up the Green New Deal resolution for a vote, they declined to consider the resolution that was offered by Senator CARPER that simply says climate change is real, that human activity during the last century has been the dominant cause of the climate crisis, and that the United States and Congress should take immediate action to address the challenges of climate change.

The challenges we face are too great to waste time on show votes and political stunts. For years, we have heard of the things we can do to make a difference. There is not one approach; it is an "all of the above" approach. We know—and I have seen the models—

what we can do to start bringing the temperature down to an international goal, by the way, of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit. That is a lot, but our wanting to stay under that amount is actually a realistic goal right now.

Instead of spending time debating these kinds of show resolutions, we should be taking real action to combat climate change. We need a comprehensive approach that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote energy-efficient technologies and home-grown energy resources. That is what we should do. When Senator MCCONNELL brought up what was an aspirational resolution to bring people together, he did it as a show to divide people. That is not what we want to do here. We have people from all over the country who have some different views on this, and we should be coming together to figure out solutions. As I noted, I believe we must reinstate the Clean Power Plan rules and the gas mileage standards that the administration has reversed, which has rolled back the progress we have made.

I also want to talk today about my home State's work on these issues.

I am proud Minnesota has taken a proactive and innovative approach to energy use and sustainability, which is critical to addressing carbon emissions and climate change. As I noted, that 25-percent electricity standard would be met and is going to be met by 2025. This bipartisan bill was signed into law by Governor Pawlenty in 2007, and it passed the House back then.

By the way, that was 2007, right? Since then, everything we have learned has reinforced what we know, which is that climate change is happening. Back in 2007, we had not seen this big push against doing something about it. We had not seen all of the dark money that went in to take care of not doing something about it and to back up this inertia we are seeing. Yet, somehow, back in 2007, in my State, I guess we got it through—we got around some of this—because that legislation that was signed by a Republican Governor received overwhelmingly bipartisan support. It passed the Minnesota House by a vote of 123 to 10 and passed the Minnesota Senate by 63 to 3.

Earlier this month, our new Governor, Governor Walz, announced a proposal that would build on that earlier work by setting a goal of generating 100 percent of the State's energy from clean sources by 2050. We have also seen other Governors doing this across the country. I think that is great. Justice Brandeis once said that the States are laboratories of democracy, which is a good thing. We can't just sit there and expect States, on an individual basis, to change the national dialogue. Some of these things have to be done by us in this Chamber in Washington, DC.

Once we set those goals, which started with the Republican Governor of Minnesota and then moved on to two Democratic Governors, what we saw

was Xcel Energy—Minnesota's largest utility—as being the earliest supporter of the last administration's Clean Power Plan. This is an electric utility—the biggest one in our State—that recently announced plans to deliver 100-percent carbon-free electricity to its customers by 2050. As part of that pledge, it plans to reduce carbon emissions by 80 percent by 2030 in the eight States it serves. It is an electric company—a power utility—that has realized this is in its best long-term interest and that it is certainly in the best long-term interest of its customers.

If energy utilities like Xcel understand the need to reduce our use of fossil fuels and to embrace setting ambitious goals that will eventually get us to 100-percent clean renewable energy, then so should we and so should the administration.

We know energy innovation can't really take root—not in any kind of serious way—without there being certainty, stability, and a clear path forward. Yes, some of that can happen in the States, and that is exciting. It can happen in our businesses and in businesses in Minnesota, like Cargill—the biggest private company in the country—that looks at the world and sees what is going to happen to its investors and its employees if we don't do something about climate change. It has joined in an effort with major businesses to take this on. So, yes, States are doing things, and Governors are doing things.

Yes, electric utilities are doing things. Some of our small electric utilities in Minnesota have actually started creating incentives for solar panels. One of the most innovative ones will give its customers—this is a very small town in a small county—large water heaters that cost about \$1,000 if, in exchange, they will get solar panels.

Senator HOEVEN and I worked on a bill to make sure people in this Chamber understood that these large water heaters were really helpful in the basements of farmhouses and that they were actually more energy efficient. Then this utility—a little electric co-op—took a step forward and actually offered a free water heater in exchange for buying a long-term interest in a solar panel. It is not as easy when you are a small electric co-op. I have a ton of them in my State, and I have worked with them extensively, but they, too, are starting to see the future and are starting to do their part.

In my State, we have big businesses like Cargill, big electric utilities like Xcel, and little electric co-ops. We have our Governors. We have businesses that are not in the electric business but that see what is happening to their customers around the world. We have universities, nonprofits, churches, synagogues, and mosques that want to retrofit and make their places of worship more energy efficient, which is another bill I have with Senator HOEVEN. When all of this is going on, how can we just sit here and do nothing and in-

stead have negative show votes for no reason at all? We are going to keep talking about this and not let it go because what we need is action.

We need policies that encourage reduction in greenhouse gasses. We must leave our children with a world that is as good as the one we got.

There is an old Ojibwe saying—we have a lot of proud Indian Tribes in Minnesota—that says: You make decisions not for now but for seven generations from now.

You know what. That is our duty. But guess what. With climate change, it is no longer just seven generations now; it is for the pages who are sitting right here, because this is happening right now. The predictions are dire.

I was in Florida just a few weeks ago, and they predict that in a decade, 1 out of 10 of their homes is going to be flooded in their State—1 out of 10 of their homes.

You see what is happening in Norfolk, VA. You look at these pages and you think: This is not just seven generations from now; this is 7 years from now or 70 years from now. That is what we are dealing with. It is upon us. So it is our duty, our constitutional duty as elected representatives, to do our job. It is our moral duty to do the right thing for this country. So let's get to work and get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to correct the record concerning statements the President reportedly made yesterday afternoon when he met with Senate Republicans.

Apparently, in between his efforts to stiff hurricane victims in Puerto Rico and tear affordable healthcare away from millions of Americans, the President claimed that Democrats were holding up ambassadorial nominations in the Senate. Just weeks ago, we heard similar comments from the Senate majority leader, who claimed that GEN John Abizaid's nomination to be Ambassador to Saudi Arabia was "being held up."

Let me be clear. No one wants to see the State Department vested with all the resources it needs to effectively conduct American foreign policy, including qualified and capable staff, more than I do. We cannot promote our foreign policy, protect American citizens, advocate for American businesses, or advance American values without a robust diplomatic core.

I want all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know that each time the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has received nominations, I have dedicated my time and staff resources to efficiently and diligently vet and advance these nominations. In the last Congress, the committee reported 169 nominations. So I reject the assertion that we have not done our part to ensure that the State Department is appropriately staffed.

Now let me speak to General Abizaid because no one can honestly claim that the Foreign Relations Committee has been anything but extremely diligent and expeditious with this nomination.

With my full support, General Abizaid appeared in the very first committee nominations hearing of this Congress, and I very much look forward to voting in favor of his nomination as soon as our chairman—our Republican chairman—exercises his prerogative and puts him before the committee for a vote.

As with all nominees, the timing of his consideration by the full Senate is under the control of the majority leader.

It is clear that President Trump has an inaccurate or dishonest view of the nominations situation in the Senate and particularly in the Foreign Relations Committee.

We cannot confirm diplomats we do not have. All too often, the committee has received nominations late or not at all. The Trump administration took nearly 2 years before it even bothered to nominate General Abizaid, leaving a gaping hole in our diplomatic posture to Saudi Arabia and the region.

To go nearly 2 years without putting forward a nominee is a failure of leadership, pure and simple. Saudi Arabia's actions over the past 2 years highlight the fact that we need an adult on the ground, which is why I wholeheartedly support General Abizaid and look forward to what I hope is his speedy confirmation.

Sadly, Saudi Arabia is not an isolated example. It took even longer—more than 2 years—for the Trump administration to nominate a candidate to be U.S. Ambassador to Turkey. Astonishingly enough, it was only this week that the President sent up an ambassadorial nominee for Mexico. We are now 26 months into the Trump administration, and we still lack ambassadorial nominees to critical countries such as Egypt, Pakistan, and our close ally, Jordan.

Let's be clear. This is the President's reckless abdication of a constitutional responsibility essential to projecting American power abroad. When you don't nominate someone, President Trump has only himself to blame.

Furthermore, there is unfortunately another severe problem that we cannot ignore with regard to the administration's nominees. When the Trump administration repeatedly fails to appropriately vet political nominations, Congress must exercise appropriate oversight. The President has nominated and renominated individuals with restraining orders for threats of violence; people who made material omissions, sometimes on a repeated basis, in their nomination materials; people who tweeted and retweeted vile things about Senators and their families and who have engaged in incidents that should, frankly, mean they should never have been nominated.

One nominee attacked my late colleague and good friend Senator John

McCain, claiming that John McCain, an American hero, was rolling “out the welcome mat for ISIS on America’s southern border.” But unfortunately we know that attacking McCain does not cross any redlines for this President.

Another nominee has claimed, with no evidence, that Senator CRUZ’s wife is part of a sinister cabal seeking to combine the Governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This nominee called Hillary Clinton a “terrorist with amnesia” and retweeted someone calling Senator ROMNEY a “dumbass.”

You can’t make this stuff up.

Senator SASSE’s office said that nominee should “put on his tinfoil hat and visit our office with evidence for his salacious conspiracy theories and cuckoo allegations” and went on to observe that “People who want to serve Americans as our diplomats and spokespersons abroad should know that words and truth matter, even during campaigns. Cynics and nuts are probably going to have a hard time securing Senate confirmation.” I couldn’t agree with him more.

Yet the President thought highly enough of this individual and lowly enough of the U.S. Senate that he nominated him for an ambassadorship in two successive Congresses.

Another ambassadorial nominee was the subject of a temporary restraining order after she left a bullet-ridden target practice sheet on her doctor’s chair.

Again, you cannot make this up.

As for being unresponsive to committee requirements for all nominees, I can understand that nominees may accidentally leave off a few businesses they were involved in, but we had one nominee who failed to inform the committee of dozens of businesses and another nominee who, even more egregiously, failed to mention multiple lawsuits he was involved in, including one in which he was alleged to have fired a female employee who complained of sexual harassment. Given the nature and frequency of these omissions, it is hard to believe they were unintentional.

So when the White House, either through negligence or incompetence, sends us unvetted, unqualified nominees—incapable and oftentimes offensive—my staff and I exercise due diligence on behalf of the American people.

To make this crystal clear, the President can speed up this process. All he has to do is start nominating Americans with appropriate credentials and honorable conduct in their careers. It is not rocket science.

The United States and our allies continue to face tremendous challenges around the world. We must continue to lead on the international stage and work in collaboration with international partners to achieve our shared security goals. But to have our diplomats in place, they must be nomi-

nated in a timely fashion and vetted properly. That is what the real holdup here is—not Senate Democrats. And I refuse to let the President point the finger at us when he should be pointing the finger at himself.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. SCOTT of Florida assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senate democratic whip.

S. 874

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the Dream Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that would give immigrant students who grew up in the United States a chance to earn their citizenship. This is not a new topic. It was 19 years ago that I introduced the Dream Act. It hasn’t become law yet, but it has inspired a movement of thousands of young people across this country.

Back in the day when I introduced this bill and talked about the Dreamers, people thought you were talking about a British rock group. In this case, the Dreamers happened to be a group of people living in America who were desperately trying to become part of America’s future. They came to the United States as children, infants, toddlers, and kids. They are American in every way except for a piece of paper on their immigration status. They have gone to our schools. They sit next to us in church. They are the kids whom you see on the playground with your own kids, but they are undocumented. Because they are undocumented, they are subject to deportation at any moment in their lives.

They end up going to school, but it is tougher for them. They don’t qualify for Pell grants or Federal loans. They have to find a way to save the money or find a way to secure a scholarship that just might be available to them, but it is rare. Most of the time it means a longer period of time in college before they can finish, as they save up the money. Ultimately, they are trained to become our teachers, our nurses, our doctors, our engineers, and even our soldiers.

Yesterday I reintroduced the Dream Act. My cosponsor is Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican from South Carolina and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I want to thank LINDSEY GRAHAM for joining me in this bipartisan effort. Bipartisanship is rare in this Chamber, and on an issue of controversy, it is even rarer.

Senator GRAHAM and I have a long history of working together because we believe that Congress has an obligation to do the job we were elected to do and pass legislation that solves problems. Senator GRAHAM and I were partners in the Gang of 8—four Democratic Senators and four Republican Senators. That was the gang with the great John McCain, CHUCK SCHUMER, MARCO RUBIO, LINDSEY GRAHAM, Jeff Flake, BOB MENENDEZ, and MICHAEL BENNET.

We wrote a comprehensive immigration reform bill a few years back in

2013. We brought it to the floor of the Senate. We covered virtually every aspect of immigration law. Believe me, immigration law is a mess, and it needed that kind of comprehensive approach. We brought it up to a vote on the floor, and the vote was 68 to 32. It was a bipartisan vote. After months of working on this bill, we couldn’t have been happier. We finally had a bipartisan bill to address the immigration challenge in America.

The bill left here and went to the House of Representatives under a Republican leadership, and it died. They wouldn’t even consider it, wouldn’t debate it, and, certainly, wouldn’t vote on it. Look at the mess we have today in the United States because of our immigration laws, and consider the possibility that 6 years ago we had finally found a path that could lead us to a bipartisan solution. That path is still there.

Part of that immigration law was the Dream Act, which we are reintroducing. In 2010 I joined with Republican Senator Dick Lugar of Indiana. We called on President Obama to use his authority as President to protect these Dreamers from deportation. In other words, if we couldn’t pass the law, could the President do something to help protect them?

President Barack Obama responded. He created a program called the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. Here is what DACA said: We will give you, 2 years at a time, temporary legal status to stay in the United States and not be deported and be able to work in this country. If you want the temporary status that is renewable every 2 years, you have to report to the government, go through a comprehensive background investigation, pay a fee, and, then, we will give you a chance to stay here, go to school and work, and not be afraid of that knock on the door.

More than 800,000 Dreamers stepped forward. They came forward in an extraordinary way. I can remember the first day when then-Congressman Luis Guterierrez and I decided at Navy Pier in Chicago, which is a huge gathering place, that we would have a sit-down for these young people so they could fill out the forms and apply for DACA status. Initially, we thought we were going to have 1,000. We didn’t know what we would do with it. Then, there were 2,000, and then 3,000, and it turned out that families literally stood in line all night long for the chance to come across that threshold to sit down with a volunteer and fill out their form for DACA status. Mothers and fathers were in tears with their kids thinking: At least my son or my daughter will have a chance not to be deported and to be part of America. More than 800,000 of these Dreamers came forward, and they received DACA protection because of President Obama’s Executive order. Forty-three thousand were in my State of Illinois.

DACA has unleashed the full potential of these Dreamers, who are contributing to our country in so many ways—teachers, soldiers, engineers, and small business owners.

Then came the day with a new President—President Donald Trump. On September 5, 2017, President Trump announced that he would repeal DACA and the protections that it gave to these people. Hundreds of thousands of Dreamers faced losing their work permits and, even worse, being deported from the only country they had ever known and being sent back to places they couldn't even remember.

When President Trump announced the repeal of DACA, he called on Congress to legalize DACA. Since then, President Trump has rejected every single bipartisan deal we offered him on the subject. I am not giving up on the Dream Act, and I am not giving up on the Dreamers. You would think that after all these years and all these young people, people would be coming to the floor who are against the Dream Act and against DACA, telling horrible stories about the young people who we are talking about today. Strangely, that has never happened. I am sure there is going to be somebody to disappoint me. That is human nature. Overwhelmingly, these young people are just nothing short of amazing.

I have come to the floor of the Senate more than 100 times to tell their stories because I think that is the best way for you to understand why this issue is so important.

This is an amazing young woman. Her name is Karla Robles. Karla Robles is the 116th Dreamer whose story I have told on the floor of the Senate. She was brought to the United States from Mexico when she was 8 years old. She grew up in Chicago, where her mom and dad worked long hours in a pizza restaurant. Karla's parents told her and her brothers and sisters: No matter what happens, make sure to stay out of trouble and study really hard. It will all pay off one day.

That is exactly what Karla did. When Karla started school in the third grade, she didn't speak English, but she worked hard and quickly became an excellent student. Karla wrote me a letter and she said: "Education has been an important part of my life and the teachers who took the time to guide my family and me are a big reason I want to go into this field."

In the seventh grade, Karla received the American Legion Award—this undocumented young girl—which was given to one boy and one girl in the class who "are deemed most worthy of the high qualities of citizenship and of true Americanism."

In high school, Karla Robles was a member of the National Honor Society and the President's Club, and she was active in student government.

She participated in a program called TRUST, where she agreed to volunteer her personal time to mentor younger students. She was captain and MVP of

the varsity tennis team. She received her associate's degree from Harper College. She is now a senior at Loyola University in Chicago.

Here is a special word about Loyola University in Chicago. This is an amazing campus that is doing its best to give people just like Karla a chance in life. They have created something called Arrupe College, which is a low cost approach to higher education for some of the poorest families in Chicago, and they don't exclude kids who are protected by DACA or are Dreamers. The Loyola medical school is one of the few in the United States with open competition where DACA students can apply. There are 32 medical students at Loyola in Chicago who are undocumented. They are DACA Dreamers. They desperately want to be part of America. Part of the agreement is if they go to medical school at Loyola and borrow money to do it, they have to pay back a year of service in an underserved area in the State of Illinois for the money that they are receiving to go to school.

Back to Karla.

During college, she was on the National Honor Roll and the Dean's List. She also volunteers with an outreach program for at-risk kids and with AmeriCorps VISTA, and she founded a tutoring program for elementary school students.

I know Karla a little better than I know some of the Dreamers because she interned here in my Washington, DC, office last year. What does she want to do at the end of this journey if she can stay in America? She wants to be a teacher in the Chicago Public Schools. She wants to pursue her master's degree and become a high school guidance counselor.

There are some people who look at this picture and say: This is not an American citizen. Tell her to leave. I look at this picture and think that we are lucky to have her, that this Nation of immigrants is lucky to have this young woman who simply wants to give back to America. That is all she is asking for—nothing special—just to let her give back to this country.

So we have reintroduced the Dream Act. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come forward and join me and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, my Republican cosponsor.

We think there are about 1.8 million young people who are eligible for the Dream Act in the United States. They have never known another country. In the mornings, when they walk into the classrooms in their schools, they stand up and put their hands on their chests and pledge allegiance to the only flag they have ever known. They were just kids when they were brought here. Shouldn't we do the right thing in America—this Nation of immigrants, this country of opportunity, this bright city on the hill, this shining city on the hill?

Yes, we should.

For the Dreamers and for their moms and dads, we have to renew our com-

mitment that the next generation of Americans who will come from all over the world will continue to make this one of the finest countries on Earth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Iowa.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, we rise to celebrate Women's History Month.

This month is, of course, very personal to me as a woman, a daughter, and a mother. One of the sayings I love is: "Well-behaved women seldom make history." This is so true. I want to reflect on a few of these fearless females—trailblazers—who have made history and who have shaped our future.

These are women like suffrage leader Carrie Chapman Catt. She founded the League of Women Voters in 1920, which was 2 years after she helped women gain the right to vote. Catt relocated to Iowa when she was 7 years old, and she graduated from what is now Iowa State University, my alma mater. She was so committed to the cause of women that she helped found the International Woman Suffrage Alliance to help spread rights for women all around our globe.

I fast-forward to today, when one can see the fruits of her labor. In Iowa, we just elected our first female Governor—my friend and a fearless female, Kim Reynolds. We also gained two new women lawmakers with the election of ABBY FINKENAUER and CINDY AXNE and a record number of women in the Iowa State House, led by Speaker of the House Linda Upmeyer. In Congress, we have a record number of women who serve in the U.S. House and 25 who serve in the U.S. Senate. While we come from differing backgrounds and political stripes, I admire these women for jumping into the arena.

I also reflect on a woman named Deborah Sampson. Sampson is credited as the first woman to serve in the U.S. Army. This hero, who couldn't serve openly as a female, disguised herself as a male and joined the Continental Army in 1781. She led forces on a mission that helped to capture 15 enemy soldiers. She served as a scout, dug trenches, and endured battle wounds. She even extracted a pistol ball from her own leg so no one would know she was a female.

Fast-forward to today, when thousands of women are serving in the military and are taking on bigger and badder roles. They are all brave, fierce, and honorable. They are modern-day Deborah Sampsons.

I think of the wonderful women with whom I served in the Army and of all of those whom I commanded—my wonderful mechanics, my truckdrivers, my admin specialists. I think of my daughter, who is a cadet at West Point, as well as Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson, and so many other women who serve in Active Duty, as reservists, and as National Guardsmen. They all serve our great Nation.

Finally, I reflect on Gertrude Dieken. Dieken was from Grundy County, IA. She was an editor and the first woman vice president of the *Farm Journal*—a renowned magazine that is dedicated to farming. Savvy in business, economics, and journalism, Dieken established a book publishing division and became the first female member of its board of directors.

Iowa women are today exercising their girl power, making it happen on the shop floor, in the boardroom, on the farm, and in every occupation in between. Iowa is now ranked eighth for growth in the number of women-owned businesses.

As part of my 99 County Tour, I have met many of these phenomenal women and have heard their stories and dreams for their futures. I am continually inspired by these fearless females and the thousands of other women like them who have paved the path forward and broken—shattered—that glass ceiling. They are changing lives and are helping our economy and our communities grow.

We know it isn't always easy today to be a fearless female, just as it was not easy for the trailblazing women of the past. We must continue to take on the challenges that confront women from all walks of life—harassment, abuse, and discrimination. Keeping the economy strong, along with issues like childcare access, criminal justice reform, healthcare, and paid parental leave, are areas in which I am working to move that ball forward.

Melinda Gates often says, “When women and girls are empowered to participate fully in society, everyone benefits.” I believe that to be true.

The future is bright for women today—in particular, for young women—because of the sacrifices of those who have come before us. We have a common bond as females, sisters, mothers, grandmothers, and daughters. It is easy to look at these historical examples as a mere recitation of facts and figures, but I view them as a challenge—a challenge to all women to stand strong and reject the status quo, to achieve greatness, to be a friend and a mentor, and to prove all of those doubters wrong. Whether you are a stay-at-home mom or a woman in America's boardrooms or anywhere in between, you are making a difference.

As Peggy Whitson—famed astronaut and first female to command the International Space Station—once said: “If a farmer's daughter from Iowa can be an astronaut, you can be just about anything you want to be.”

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, it is my honor to be here with my fellow woman Senator from the State of Iowa. I enjoy learning more about Iowa and about the strength of Iowan women and in our Nation.

I join my colleague to highlight and celebrate not only the women leaders

in the Senate but the millions of women throughout history and across the country who have made and continue to make a difference in their homes, in their communities, and in society in general.

I am very proud to represent the State of West Virginia—a State with a long and rich history of female trailblazers. It is a State that respects and celebrates those women. Maybe you have heard that phrase “mountain mamas.” Well, Mother's Day was actually originated in West Virginia by Grafton resident Anna Jarvis in 1908. President Woodrow Wilson made it an official national holiday in the year 1914, and it is an annual reminder today to cherish and thank one of the, if not the, most influential women in many people's lives—their mothers.

I miss my mother every day. I know my mother, who was the First Lady of West Virginia, was an incredible role model for me and an inspiration. Seeing all she did for our State and for our fellow West Virginians through her public service was a driving force throughout my life. Not only that, she was a great and loving mother, and as I said, I still miss her every day.

Another West Virginia woman who has been an incredible inspiration is Katherine Johnson. Katherine was born in White Sulphur Springs, WV, in 1918. In her being brilliant with numbers, she attended West Virginia State College and was later one of the first Black students to integrate West Virginia University's graduate school in 1939. That is pretty notable in and of itself, but Katherine didn't stop there.

In 1953, she took a job at NASA and began working as a human computer. She literally calculated how to get men into space. Remember, with the launch of the Soviets' satellite Sputnik in 1957, the space race was on. America needed a win, and Katherine Johnson played a major role in facilitating that win. Her work put John Glenn into space and into history. The success of that mission marked a turning point in the space race altogether, and it made a significant impact in the future of space travel and exploration. Some may better recognize Katherine's name from the movie “Hidden Figures.”

I am proud to say that in tribute to Katherine and her incredible legacy at NASA, I introduced legislation to rename West Virginia's only NASA facility after her. President Trump signed that bill into law last year, and Fairmont, WV, is now the home of the Katherine Johnson Independent Verification & Validation Facility. At 100 years young, Katherine still serves as a tremendous role model to me and to women everywhere.

Of course, all of our States are home to brilliant women. My home of West Virginia is home to numerous amazing women who have made significant contributions, and we are proud to claim them all.

I don't know if one remembers America's sweetheart of 1984, Olympic gold

medalist Mary Lou Retton, who is a native of West Virginia; Mother Jones, who is a champion of the working class and a labor organizer who campaigned for the United Mine Workers; Pulitzer Prize-winning author Pearl S. Buck; the host of the “TODAY” show, Hoda Kotb; actress and advocate Jennifer Garner; and Saira Blair. Many of you have never heard of Saira Blair. Several years ago, at the age of 18, she became the youngest person ever—male or female—to get elected to a State or Federal office. She served in the West Virginia House of Delegates.

These incredible women and so many others have helped to shape history and society, and they have paved the way for the next generation of leaders—girls and young women who might not yet have realized or achieved their full potential.

In 2015, I was sworn in as West Virginia's first female Senator. This distinction is a privilege for me, and it is an honor. It is certainly nothing I take lightly. I may well be the very first female Senator from West Virginia, but I am very confident that I will not be the last—certainly, not if I can help it.

So, shortly after I came to the Senate, I started an initiative called West Virginia Girls Rise Up because I want to inspire the next generation of leaders. Through that program, I visit fifth grade girls across the State. We talk about their dreams, what they can be when they grow up, and how they can be the best versions of themselves.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from Iowa mentioned the astronaut, Peggy Whitson. She was with me when I did two Girls Rise Up in West Virginia, and we talked about three different accomplishments that girls can do to reach their full potential—education, physical fitness, and self-confidence. I believe these are the building blocks for a successful future for whatever you want to do.

Then we set goals. Maybe it is reading more. Maybe it is eating healthier. Maybe it is raising your hand more in class. Most importantly, I challenged these girls to achieve these goals.

What I hope the girls get out of this is that you can reach a goal you set for yourself now—or at least really work hard to—and you can reach your next goal when you get older. Then you can reach your next goal and your next goal and your next goal, until you find yourself doing groundbreaking research in a lab, being a CEO of a Fortune 500 company, designing a skyscraper at an architectural firm, or working to make our country a better place from the floor of the U.S. Senate or, I will add, as President of the United States.

The possibilities are endless, but the common thread is this: Think about what it is you want, work hard to make your dreams a reality, and have confidence to never back down.

As I travel across West Virginia with my West Virginia Girls Rise Up Program, I am constantly amazed at the

potential of the young women I see. I know the same is true in States across this country.

I hope those girls are watching us here in this Chamber today. I hope they are hearing the stories of the incredible women and trailblazers who have come before us. I hope they are thinking to themselves: That could be me one day.

I am incredibly proud to be a part of what female leaders are doing right now, but I am more incredibly optimistic to see what our future female leaders will do in the years ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognizing Women's History Month and celebrating the countless women who have shaped our Nation and those who continue to devote their time and energy to the pursuit of equality here at home and abroad.

Women have demonstrated incredible perseverance in the face of adversity. Their stories of fighting for equal opportunity are ingrained in the history of our country. We wouldn't be the great Nation that we are without those who paved the path for a more promising future for women.

We honor the individuals whose remarkable courage and dedication to challenging the status quo helped advance women's rights and those who followed their dreams while breaking the glass ceiling.

In 1932, Arkansas elected Hattie Caraway to the U.S. Senate, which made her the first woman elected to this body. She broke barriers, changed norms, and helped lay the foundation for the new role women were beginning to be recognized as deserving to play in the Senate throughout her legislative career.

Senator Caraway served nearly 14 years in the Senate, where in 1933 she was the first woman to chair a Senate committee and in 1943 became the first woman to preside officially over the Senate.

Arkansans are particularly proud that our legacy in the U.S. Senate includes electing the first woman to serve in this Chamber. The path that Hattie Caraway trailblazed for more women to enter the ranks of the world's greatest deliberative body has, without a doubt, made the Senate a better, stronger institution and has benefited our Nation immensely.

Today, more women are serving in Congress than ever before. We need to look no further than Hattie Caraway to understand the magnitude of her decision to step forward and serve her State and country.

More women are also answering the call to serve our Nation in uniform. Women are the fastest growing demographic of veterans, but many Department of Veterans Affairs facilities don't have the ability to provide equitable care or services to our women veterans.

This Congress, Senator TESTER and I have reintroduced legislation to eliminate barriers to care and services that many women veterans face. The legislation is appropriately named for Deborah Sampson—the Deborah Sampson Act—which honors the service and sacrifice of the American Revolution hero who actually disguised herself as a man in order to serve in the Continental Army.

We can be proud of Deborah Sampson and the countless women patriots who have followed in her footsteps.

We must update VA services to support the unique needs of our entire veteran population, including the growing number of women relying on VA for care.

While opportunities remain to advance women's equality, the United States recently took an important step to empower women worldwide. Congress approved and President Trump signed into law the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act. Senator CARDIN and I introduced the legislation to eliminate global gender-related barriers and empower female entrepreneurs around the world.

In some parts of the world, women are pushed so far to the sidelines that they are denied access to even the most basic financial services. Cultural and historical barriers prevent women from launching a business, building savings, and supporting economic growth in their communities. Leveling the playing field will help the world economy grow substantially.

Providing women access to tools for economic success supports global prosperity. Our country can lead by example and help deliver these tools and empower women. I look forward to seeing women succeed because of this legislative effort.

I am a dad of three daughters and a grandfather to two little girls. I want women across the globe to have the same access to resources and opportunities that my girls have because I have seen with my own eyes how limitless their potential is.

Earlier this year, President Trump launched the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative to empower women around the world to fulfill their economic potential. The Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act is an essential piece of this plan to deliver global results.

Empowering women strengthens families, communities, and our Nation. As we take this time to reflect on the challenges women have overcome and still face, let us continue the momentum started generations ago by hard-working, courageous, and determined women who envisioned a country full of opportunities for success for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate has unanimously rejected the so-

called Green New Deal. In a display of political courage for the ages, 43 Democrats voted present, including many of the bill's own sponsors.

Now, many of them are running for President. In fact, these days, it seems that all of the Democratic Senators are running for President and perhaps may realize what a disaster the Green New Deal is for them.

The Green New Deal would force a transition in just 10 years—one decade—to 100 percent green energy, whatever that is. But it is an impossible goal that would require trillions of dollars of taxes and the effective nationalization of private industry in America.

That is not all—no, not all.

The Green New Deal would also overhaul or rebuild all existing buildings in the United States to achieve maximum energy efficiency—all—every single home and building in America. I guess you could call it the “Extreme Home Makeover Mandate.”

The Green New Deal also calls for taxpayer-funded college and jobs for every person in the country, even for illegal aliens and even if you are unable or unwilling to work. That is according to a press release the Democrats sent out and then tried to send down the memory hole when it was justly mocked, and understandably so.

Jobs for everyone who is unable to work and unwilling to work—there is a big difference between those two groups of people.

The radical nature of the Green New Deal cannot be overstated. The amount of control it would give to politicians and planners in Washington would be the envy of Soviet Russia. Actually, it would make Stalin blush. And it would take Stalinist tactics to achieve a Green New Deal.

To borrow from Churchill, “Socialism may begin with the best of intentions, but it always ends with the Gestapo.” Who else is going to come into your home and make sure that it is energy compliant? Who else is going to confiscate your gas-using pickup truck? Who else is going to ensure that you don't commit the terrible crime of eating a hamburger?

Perhaps we can come up with a better name for the Green New Deal—one that reflects its true lineage. Might I suggest the Red New Deal, the color of Communist regimes the world over, or perhaps the Green Leap Forward in honor of Mao.

I gather some House freshmen might actually feel pretty comfortable with those labels. They claim these radical ideas are necessary to stop the threat of climate change—a threat so dire, the Democrats insist—so dire that we will all be dead in 12 years—12 years—if we don't surrender to totalitarian levels of power over our lives to central planners in Washington.

Yet we gave them a chance to vote on this existential, apocalyptic threat and they all said: Meh, maybe later.

So this isn't really about climate change or even the environment. I

mean, come on. What do free college for rich kids and guaranteed jobs for lazy bums have to do with climate change?

The answer is: Nothing. And that tells you all you need to know about what the Democrats are up to.

The Green New Deal isn't a real policy proposal. It is just the Democrats' most fanciful and frightful dreams wrapped in one shiny package. I would call it a policy platform, but that would probably give it too much credit for substance.

The President put it very well. He said the Green New Deal is more like an undergraduate term paper, one written late at night after too many bong hits, judging from its botched rollout.

If you really feared a climate catastrophe, you would do a couple of simple things. First, you would build as many new, beautiful, carbon-free nuclear powerplants as you could. But the Green New Deal omits nuclear energy entirely, no doubt to please the Democrats' crony renewable energy lobbyists and the anti-nuclear know-nothings in the Democrats' base.

Second, you would get tough on the world's biggest polluters, especially on China. Foreign nations, after all, have driven almost all of the growth in global carbon emissions since the turn of the century.

But the Green New Dealers seem to believe America is the root of all of the world's problems, even though our emissions have been declining. It is just another case of the Democrats' guiding principle: Blame America first.

Of course, if we did something as stupid as pass the Green New Deal, most foreign nations would just laugh at us and keep building their economies and keep polluting while we tanked our own economy, immiserated our citizens, and lost millions of jobs in pursuit of a fantasy.

The Green New Deal would amount to America's unilateral disarmament on the world stage, which for some Democrats is probably a feature and not a bug. But sometimes even terrible ideas deserve a vote. So we gave them a vote on the Green New Deal, and the bill's own sponsors complained.

In any event, the Senate flunked the Democrats' term paper unanimously, and the only reason the Green New Deal got an F is that there is not a lower grade. So common sense prevailed this time, although I have a feeling this is not the last time we have heard of the Green New Deal.

Remember, this is not the hobby horse of some eccentric socialist fringe of the Democratic Party—oh, no, not at all. The Green New Deal has 90 Democratic cosponsors in the House. That is nearly two out of every five House Democrats, and the Democratic Presidential candidates have rushed to endorse the Green New Deal. Remember that when you step into the voting booth in 2020.

But let me wrap up on a more serious note. I have made a lot of jokes about

the Green New Deal, and, believe me, the Green New Deal is laughable. But for many Americans, the Green New Deal is no laughing matter.

Imagine, if you will, a mom and dad and a couple young kids outside Little Rock, let's say. Every day, they drive the kids to school. They commute into the city where they work and back out to the suburbs, just so they can afford a home. When they are home on the weekends, maybe they try to fire up the grill on the patio to have a little cookout for the kids.

This working-class family is doing its best to live the American dream and pass it on to their kids. The Green New Deal is not for that family. It would outlaw their entire way of life, from the minivan in the garage to the hamburgers on their grill, to the house they call home.

The Green New Deal would be a death sentence for America's families. Yet the Democrats have the nerve to sell it as a rescue mission. I reject that fraud on America, and now so does the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, March is Women's History Month. A number of my colleagues have been coming to the floor and talking about the accomplishments of particular women in their States. I want to do the same thing.

When Virginia Minor, a St. Louisan, was denied the ability to register to vote in 1872, she took her case all the way to the Supreme Court. While she wasn't successful at the Supreme Court level, she remained a leader in the suffrage movement and later testified before the Senate Select Committee on Woman Suffrage in 1889. Remember that women didn't get the right to vote until 1920. So she was working on this with thousands of others for a long time. She is also one of seven women represented in the Missouri State Capitol's Hall of Famous Missourians.

Virginia Minor and her fellow suffragettes blazed a trail of political leadership that others followed. In 1952 Leonor Sullivan became the first woman in Congress from Missouri. During the 24 years that she served in the House, she became the first woman appointed to the House Democratic Steering Committee. She was elected secretary, one of the elected leaders, of the House Democratic caucus for five terms.

Our former colleague, Senator Claire McCaskill, won her Senate race in 2006. With that, she became the first woman elected to the U.S. Senate from Missouri. Certainly, Senator McCaskill and I disagreed on plenty of things over the years, but, frankly, when it came to the big issues affecting our State, we always figured out how to work together to get things done.

Also from our State, I want to recognize Margaret Kelly, who in 1984 was appointed to the position of State audi-

tor. When that happened, that made her the first woman to hold statewide office in Missouri. She was elected to a full term in 1986 and reelected two more times after that.

In Missouri, at least, you can't talk about politics and the impact on politics without talking about Phyllis Schlafly, who was a vocal and tireless advocate for conservative ideas. She was never afraid of a fight, but she also knew when to celebrate what was possible. One of the great things about Phyllis Schlafly was that she knew how to win, when you could win, and what you could win, when you could win it, and, then, how to come back and fight for what you didn't get the first time and continue to work for more. She was a friend of mine. I value her legacy. There is no question that she impacted the political landscape of the country.

As I mentioned earlier, there are seven women represented in the Hall of Famous Missourians. Two of them were committed lifelong to education. In 1873 Susan Blow, who was born in St. Louis, founded the first public kindergarten in the United States in the Des Peres public school in Carondelet. In 1818 Saint Rose Duchesne opened the first Sacred Heart school outside of Europe. The Academy of the Sacred Heart was the first free school west of the Mississippi and the first Catholic school in what would eventually become the St. Louis Archdiocese. I mentioned that this was Saint Rose Duchesne, one of the first women to be an American who rose to the level of sainthood.

There are also a few world figures in that hall of fame, like Josephine Baker, who was not only an iconic entertainer but also a civil rights activist and, interestingly, a member of the French resistance during World War II while she was entertaining in Europe. In our hall of fame, she is joined by other entertainers, like Ginger Rogers and Betty Grable.

The seventh woman honored in the State capitol is Sacagawea, who, of course, was part of the Lewis and Clark expedition into Missouri and up the Missouri River and other territories of the Louisiana Purchase.

To cover all of the notable Missouri women in history would be impossible. To talk about the countless women who are making an incredible impact in our State today would be impossible—people who are devoted to public service, who are successful entrepreneurs, who serve our country in the Armed Forces, and so much more. Those women and others continue to help lead our country and to inspire younger women. There is a reason that March is Women's History Month, and thousands and thousands—maybe millions—of Missouri women would easily qualify in that category of people who have made a difference in history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as we celebrate Women's History Month, I am proud to spotlight Wyoming's great history and achievements for women's equality.

Wyoming is the "Equality State"—the first State to give women the right to vote and hold public office. We actually did it before statehood. Long before statehood, in 1869, the Wyoming Territory was the first to grant women the right to vote.

Louisa Ann Swain of Laramie became the first woman in the United States to vote in a general election in 1870, and Wyoming insisted on protecting women's right to vote as a precondition for even joining the Union in 1890.

Now, that is not all. The first elected woman Governor in the United States, Nellie Taylor Ross, was Wyoming's 14th Governor.

Wyoming women continue to hold key elected offices today, with strong leaders like U.S. Representative LIZ CHENEY.

The State owes a debt of gratitude to all of these extraordinary women leaders.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Now I would like to turn to this week's debate over the Democrats' so-called Green New Deal.

The Green New Deal isn't about protecting our environment. It is about increasing the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Every Democrat Senator running for President supports the Green New Deal. They have cosponsored it—each and every one of them, every single one.

By cosponsoring the Green New Deal, these Senators have shown Americans what they actually do support as candidates and as an agenda for America, and that is massively increasing the size of government.

This year the Federal Government is projected to spend over \$4 trillion. That amount includes everything—Social Security, national defense, Medicare, all of it. If we were to pass the Green New Deal, it would cost up to \$93 trillion over the next 10 years. That is \$9.3 trillion a year—more than double what our government currently spends.

So, you see, the Green New Deal would massively expand the Federal Government, and that is exactly what Democrat Senators running for President want and plan to do, if elected. Don't be confused by Senate Democrats' ducking this vote on the Green New Deal. This is where Democrats would take our country if they were to retake the White House.

The Green New Deal would bankrupt our Nation, would wreak havoc, and would wreck the economy.

Republicans' pro-growth, pro-jobs policies have strengthened the economy and improved the lives of American families in their everyday lives at home. Because of tax relief, millions of families have more money now in their pockets to decide what to spend, what to save, and what to invest.

The Green New Deal plan would eliminate fossil fuels by requiring 100 percent renewable, carbon-free energy in just 10 years. Talk about having extra money in your pocket to fill your gas tank, but just putting gas in the car would be extremely difficult if the Green New Deal were to come to pass.

On the issue of climate change, climate change is real, but the Green New Deal is unrealistic. While it is important, in 2017 wind and solar energy generated just 8 percent of our electricity. Should we have more? Yes, but 8 percent of what we need is certainly inadequate.

Affordable and reliable fossil fuels, like coal and natural gas, power three out of five U.S. homes and businesses. Excluding fossil fuels would snuff out the bright lights of Americans' prosperity. It would threaten national security. It would threaten jobs. It would threaten our independence from foreign energy, and all Americans' higher standard of living.

What Democrats are proposing is essentially a pipe dream. It is no surprise that Democrats have yet to provide a cost estimate. They don't want Americans to know that the Green New Deal could cost up to \$93 trillion over the next 10 years. That is roughly \$65,000 each and every year for each and every family in America.

The Nation is already over \$22 trillion in debt. So how are they planning to pay for this? By doing what they often plan to do—raising taxes.

Paying for a \$93 trillion bill would empty just about every Americans' savings account in the country, and let's not forget that the Green New Deal would not actually solve the problems they are trying to solve. Really, the proposal amounts to unrealistic economic disarmament.

Plus, U.S. economic decline would harm the environment. That is what we are hearing from the Green New Deal. It would be unilateral harm to our economy and no improvement to the overall global climate. They want it done immediately. They want it done drastically. It is a level of alarm that is not in any way called for.

When you think about the American economy and what we are able to do in this country, it is a strong economy that allows for a clean environment. The stronger the economy, often the cleaner the environment is. That is certainly the case here, when you compare us around the world to other countries and their economies and their environments.

The label "Made in America" means more than just the country of origin. It means the better the environment. We are being asked to destroy—that is what the Democrats are asking us to do with this Green New Deal—our strong, growing, and improving economy and allow the largest polluters in the world to grow at our expense.

Right now, 13 percent of emissions comes from the United States, but 33 percent comes from China and from

India, and emissions in the United States have been declining over the last dozen years, while they continue to go up in China and India and in other locations around the world.

Why do Democrats want to do this? Well, they would like to engineer a big government takeover—or, I should say, as they say, transformation—of the U.S. economy.

There is a real solution that will not wreck our economy, will not hurt our Nation, will not hurt people's jobs, and will not hurt American families. The solution is not taxation. It is not regulation. It is innovation. Republicans continue to work, and we do it in a bipartisan way to advance innovative strategies for reducing carbon emissions.

First, we are working to promote carbon capture, and then using that carbon and sequestering it, taking it away. That means taking carbon out of the atmosphere and using it productively. We can use it for medical projects, construction projects, and for extracting oil. You can push the carbon dioxide into the ground in the area of oil wells and get out more oil, as a result, leaving the carbon dioxide underground.

Last year, the Senate passed the bipartisan FUTURE Act. It was signed into law, and it expands tax credits for carbon capture facilities.

Now we are advancing the bipartisan USE IT Act, which will help to turn carbon that has been captured into valuable products.

A second way Republicans are working in a bipartisan way to reduce emissions is by supporting nuclear power. Nuclear power generates about 60 percent—60 percent—of American-produced carbon-free energy. By far, that is the largest source of American carbon-free energy. It is much more than double solar and wind power combined.

In late December, we passed the bipartisan Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. This legislation had Republican and Democratic support and was signed into law by President Trump. This law will help innovators develop advanced nuclear reactors that are safer, cleaner, and more versatile. That is what we need to do. It is simplifying the process on the front end for the innovators to build state-of-the-art nuclear reactors. These advanced reactors are going to power the next generation of nuclear plants. We need them to expand the use of carbon-free energy. We also need to maintain our existing nuclear powerplants, and Congress needs to address how we manage nuclear waste. Nuclear power is an area with broad bipartisan support. We must continue to work together on nuclear power.

A third approach that Republicans are taking to reduce emissions is increasing the use of renewable energy. Republicans have repeatedly passed tax incentives to promote clean energy. These include tax credits for wind and solar panels, as well as incentives for biodiesel and compressed natural gas.

We know all these innovative strategies work. We see it in America's unparalleled success in reducing emissions. This progress is not the result of taxation; it is not the result of regulation; it is the result of American innovation. Our cutting-edge technologies can be adopted globally.

Republicans want to make America's energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, while investing in promising innovations for the future. Democrats want more government control. That is what they asked for with the Green New Deal—control of our economy and control of our lives, despite the cost to American families and American taxpayers.

Let's continue to pass real climate solutions, not these far-left fantasies. Let's focus on what works for our environment and our economy, not what works for Democrats who are running for President.

Republicans are going to continue to oppose unrealistic, unworkable, and unaffordable proposals like the Green New Deal. It is a big green bomb. The Democrats are ducking it, they are dodging it, and they are now distancing themselves from it by showing up on the floor of the Senate—those who have cosponsored it, those who have gone on TV and on the hustings around the country saying they would support it and be for it—and voting not for it but present. The Democrats are ducking this for a good reason: They know what a disaster it would be for our Nation.

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 bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am on the floor today to talk about career and technical education and specifically legislation we have introduced that would provide a lot more training opportunities for people who need the in-demand jobs that are out there.

When people hear about career and technical education, sometimes they wonder what we are referring to. High school programs used to be called vocational education. Many in my generation might remember it as that. But it is not your father's Oldsmobile. It is not the old voc-ed programs you might remember. In fact, it is very impressive. If you go to these CTE schools today—and Ohio, luckily, has a lot of great career and technical academies and schools—you will see something amazing. You will see young people being trained for some of the most so-

phisticated jobs out there in bioscience and technology, welding, of course, and manufacturing—in Ohio, it is a big deal—and also CDLs for truckdrivers, commercial driver's licenses. You might see somebody there who is interested in going into firefighting or EMS. This morning, I had a chance to visit with a young man who is in a CTE program where he is going to be immediately hired by a fire department.

These are great opportunities for our young people. Right now, these CTE schools are incredibly important because the skills are needed, and the training is needed.

One of the challenges we have had, frankly, is that sometimes parents who are advising their kids are saying “You need to go to a 4-year college or university like I did” or maybe like their uncle or aunt did. Maybe that is the goal they have for their kids, and that is fine. For many young people, that is appropriate, but for others, what a great opportunity, to be able to get out of high school, get a job immediately—a good-paying job with good benefits—and then at some point, because often in these schools, including in Ohio, you get college credit while you are in high school, to go on to college later, and perhaps your employer will pay for that.

This morning, I was with a young woman named Jordan. She is at the Great Oaks career and technical center in Southwest Ohio. Jordan is becoming a welder, and, as I explained to Jordan, she is going to have amazing opportunities. She will have plenty of job opportunities because she is going to have a skill that is so badly needed in Ohio right now. Our manufacturing sector is desperate for welders, and they are willing to pay good money for welders. She can make 45,000, 50,000 bucks a year with good benefits at 18 years old as a welder instead of taking on student debt, which in Ohio is about \$27,000 on average. Somebody graduating from community college or a 4-year college or university is taking on significant debt.

This is an opportunity for us to get more young people into career and technical education. We think we ought to do it. We have a good economy right now thanks to tax reform and regulatory relief. There is a lot of hiring going on, and wages are actually higher right now. In Ohio, we have a number of people who are looking for employees. The “help wanted” signs are out there.

We have about 148,000 jobs available in the State, if you look at OhioMeansJobs.com, which is the website that offers these positions. Now, there are about 250,000 Ohioans out of work. How does that make sense? Well, it makes sense because if you look at the jobs that are being offered, for many of the jobs, you have to have a skill. You have to be a coder or a machine operator or a welder, or you have to have some bioscience background to be a tech. So if we had the

skills training, we would be able to fill these jobs, which is great for the companies and for the economy but also, again, a great opportunity for these young people.

In 2018, our economy added 223,000 jobs per month on average. That is about twice what the pre-tax reform baseline estimate was from the Congressional Budget Office of only 107,000 jobs per month. So we more than doubled it. We have also had strong wage growth over the last 12 months. In fact, wage growth in the last year was higher than at any time in the last decade.

In Ohio, frankly, for a decade and a half we have had flat wages. Finally, we are now seeing wages going up. Last month, the average was about 3.4 percent growth for private sector workers and, by the way, it is more for blue-collar workers than for white-collar workers, supervisory workers, which is all good news.

We have a lot of good things going on in terms of increasing jobs, increasing wages, increasing benefits. Much of that is due to tax reform. I have gone all around our State and talked to folks at roundtable discussions. I have been to over 25 businesses to talk specifically: What did you do with the tax savings? Every one of them has a great story, but with all these pro-growth policies kicking in, the thing I am hearing now is: Yes, the tax reform helped us. The regulatory relief is a good idea, but we need workers, we need people, and we need them to have the skills that go with the jobs we have. This mismatch between the skills that are out there and these jobs, that skills gap is the thing we need to close.

There are lots of ways to do that. The National Skills Coalition estimates that nearly half of all job openings between now and 2022 will be middle-skill jobs that require education beyond high school but not a 4-year degree. If you have a career in technical, with opportunities in high school, and then when you get out of high school, you have a certificate or you can get into a course where you can learn how to do one of these skills—although you are not getting an associate's degree or a bachelor's degree, you are getting a certificate, often a stackable certificate that can lead to a degree later—that is what is going to be needed.

In its most recent skills gap study, Deloitte and The Manufacturing Institute highlighted the fact that there are so many jobs out there that need these skills. They estimate there are about 2.4 million positions likely to be unfilled between 2018 and 2028. The economic impact of not having these jobs filled is about a \$2.5 trillion hit to our economy. This is why all of this is so important.

About 6 years ago, we started the Career and Technical Education Caucus in the Senate. At first, there were two of us, Senator Kaine from Virginia and myself. Now we have 27 Senators on the CTE Caucus. Why? Because Members are hearing back home about this,

which has been good to raise awareness for career and technical education. It has been helpful for us to put together some bipartisan legislation that helps to promote career and technical education.

Last year, in the Perkins bill, for instance, Senator Kaine and I got legislation in that helps to improve the quality of CT programs all around the country, ensuring again that college credit can be offered, helping to hold up programs to make sure young people and their parents know about this opportunity.

Just a couple weeks ago, Senator Kaine and I reintroduced legislation called Jumpstart Our Businesses by Supporting Students Act. The acronym is the JOBS Act. The JOBS Act is something we introduced in the last couple of Congresses, but I really feel its time has come. I feel it is an opportunity right now for us to move forward with the JOBS Act. One, we are hearing from all around the country the need for this, but, second, we have the likelihood of a higher education bill moving this year, which would be the perfect place to put the JOBS Act.

It is a commonsense solution to help solve the skills gap problem we are talking about. It says, with regard to Pell grants—which is for low-income students—instead of just making them available for community colleges or 4-year colleges or universities or for longer term courses, why not allow Pell grants to be used for shorter term training programs? That is what is needed right now.

I think this is a fairness issue. When I talk to students, as I did this morning here in Washington, as I do back in the State of Ohio, what they tell me is: ROB, I don't have the money to get a driver's license and go through that process, much less to get a certificate to become a welder or to become a coder or to become a tech in a hospital setting. The government will give me a Pell grant to go to a junior college or a community college or a university, but I can't get a Pell grant to help me get the training I need to actually get out there and get a job that I know is right there, ready, good pay, good benefits.

To me, that shows how our system is not working with regard to the modern economy and the needs we have right now, and it is not fair to those students. I think we ought to allow students to use Pell grants for shorter term training programs of less than 15 weeks. I also think it is a matter of efficiency of the Pell grant and the taxpayer.

Unfortunately, most people who take a Pell who go to a college don't graduate. There are lots of reasons for that. I think the main reason is because many of them have to drop out because they have to work, but, in the meantime, they don't have the degree. So they have the Pell, but they don't get the degree, not even a certificate; whereas, in these short-term training

programs, a 15-week training program—trust me, if somebody starts off in one of these training programs, it is much more likely they will end up getting the certificate. They can see just around the corner where the job is. In a sense, the certificate is the ticket to that job, and it is a shorter term prospect. I think it is a very efficient use of the Pell grant, and we should expand the Pell grant, not take it away from colleges and universities—not at all. Pell is an incredibly important program, but let's allow it to be used for short training programs.

I was at the CT Program in Akron, OH, recently. I also went to Stark State Community College. They have a new campus. We had a roundtable on workforce development. We had a lot of local businesses there talking about how great these programs have been for them. We had students there. The chamber of commerce was there. Mayor Dan Horrigan of Akron and Summit County executive Ilene Shapiro were there. I heard from students in high school and in community college who were already working for some of the local employers, businesses like the K Company, an HVAC company based in Akron. They work with Stark State; they work with local high schools; and they get young people on the right educational track to be able to work in the HVAC field where there are plenty of jobs right now. If you are an HVAC tech, you can get a job. It has been a great example of where they are helping the economy, they are helping a particular business, and they are really helping students to get a great job.

Stark State president Dr. Para Jones is very innovative, working with our high schools and working with the business community, trying to ensure we are all working together on this. Dr. Jones, the employers who were around the table, the educators who were around the table, and the students who were around that table—all of them—were really excited about the JOBS Act. They know it is going to work. They know this will help them deal with exactly the problems they are seeing in the local community.

Last week, I also toured a company in Hubbard, OH, Warren Fabricating and Machining. As always happens, I heard about the need for skilled workers. It is a great example of a company taking full advantage of the tax reform and tax cuts. They bought a beautiful, new machine that is incredibly important for their effectiveness as a company to be able to compete with China and others. They have also been able to raise people's salaries and increase the benefits with their tax savings, but their issue now is getting the workforce. They want to operate at full capacity, but they can't find the people. They have openings right now.

I also visited an advanced manufacturer called Rhinestahl Corporation in Mason, right outside of Cincinnati. They manufacture high-precision parts

for the aerospace and defense industry. Other employers were there, as well as Butler Tech, which is a local CTE program which has done really incredible, innovative work.

There, I had the opportunity to meet with a lot of students. One of them was a high school student named Jake. He is a chemical operator at a nearby manufacturer called Pilot. He is a veteran who has completed his certificate training, and his employer is now paying for him to continue his education and get a degree while working for them. Connor was there, a high school student who is running machines and learning advanced manufacturing while working at a place called RB Tool. Torez is a 19-year-old who went to the program and is now in charge of calibration and making sure precision tools are up to speed at this company, Rhinestahl.

The teacher of all these students, a guy named Dave Fox, was there. He said his last class of 28 graduates had a combined total of more than 100 job offers. Think about this. These young people going through these certificate programs, 28 young people, had more than 100 job offers. These are good job offers. We are talking about \$40,000, \$50,000 a year, jobs that pay \$18 to \$20 an hour and good benefits, and a lot of employers will pay for them to continue their education, should they choose to do so.

Last week, President Trump came to the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center in Lima, OH. This is an incredible manufacturing facility that does something unique in America, which is they build tanks. The kind of welding they have to be trained on is incredibly sophisticated and difficult to do. The kind of machine work they have to do is really difficult. Cutting the tanks' steel is an incredibly difficult task, plus some other alloys they use to protect our troops in the field. They need to hire about 400 additional workers in the next year or so, partly because, with the defense buildup, we are putting more money into the plant. I am very pleased to say President Trump in his budget put more funding into the Lima plant this year, but they need workers, and they need help training people. They need skilled welders, machinists, assembly workers, and various types of engineers.

These are good-paying jobs and great opportunities for young people. Whether they are coming up through the ranks in high school or whether they are midcareer changing jobs, it would be great for us to help them get the people they need, and the JOBS Act, they all say, would be exactly what they need to help to do that.

At a roundtable discussion at Staub Manufacturing in Dayton recently, the CEO of the company told me he believes welders coming out of high school will be better off financially than many attorneys or doctors.

I asked him what he meant by that. He pointed out that while an attorney

or another professional might make more coming right out of school, by the time they get out of school—law school, as an example—and get out of debt and start investing, the welder is well on his or her way to building a significant nest egg.

It is true. When you think about it, a welder makes, let's say, \$50,000 a year starting at age 18. Let's say there is no student debt because, again, through the certificate program and through a Pell—if we get the JOBS Act passed, in particular—this person is able to do so without any student debt. Using an online calculator and assuming about 8 percent growth, if that individual sets aside 10 percent of his or her income toward retirement, from the age of 18 up to 67—and this assumes a person gets no raise at all, which of course is not going to happen. A person is going to have a higher salary over time as the person gets more seniority, but assuming no raise, \$50,000 a year: \$2.8 million in retirement savings at age 67. That is a nice nest egg to be able to live comfortably in retirement with peace of mind.

Compare that to an attorney, let's say, making \$100,000 a year in a big law firm, starts investing at least at 30 years old, after they get through school and paying off their debt. It may be later, but let's say 30 to be conservative. If that person sets aside 10 percent of his or her income: \$2.2 million by age 67. So even though the attorney had a higher salary and was investing twice as much each month, the welder making \$50,000 a year is going to be better off.

Part of this is getting people into these jobs and getting them into jobs when they are young, where they can begin to make investments in their retirement but also make investments in a car, buy the house, start putting money aside for their kids' education, just to have the peace of mind that comes with knowing you are going to have this profession and this opportunity to get ahead early in life.

I am hoping we can get the JOBS Act passed. It would help provide so many people—particularly young people—these opportunities. If we can shift the paradigm, stop this notion of thinking that everybody who is going through high school needs to go to a 4-year college or university right away and instead think about, how do you ensure that this young person can have an opportunity to get ahead in life, learn a skill where there is an immediate need, and actually help our economy? Because our biggest challenge right now, as I see it—not just in the manufacturing sector, where it is particularly obvious, but across the board, in bio-science, certainly in moving, transportation, truckdriving, and other professions, the biggest challenge we have right now is workforce. This would do both.

The JOBS Act has been endorsed by the National Skills Coalition, the Association for Career and Technical Edu-

cation, the Association of Community Colleges and Trustees—I know community colleges have put this highest on their list—and other groups.

I am also pleased to say, again, it is in the budget. President Trump puts together a budget every year. This year's budget actually has our JOBS Act included in it. It is one that is totally bipartisan.

Senator Kaine from Virginia and I have been the coauthors of this legislation over the years. We continue to work closely together on this. We have 10 cosponsors already, having just introduced this a couple weeks ago. It is a bipartisan group, mixed, Republicans and Democrats. We also have a lot of outside stakeholders supporting it, and, again, it is now in the President's budget.

The reason we are getting all this support is it works. It works. It will cover programs that, at a minimum, require 150 hours and 8 weeks to complete. There are some alternative programs that limit them by requiring them to be 320 hours. I will tell you our community colleges tell me none of their short-term training programs would qualify for that higher number of hours—programs like welding, precision machining, electrical trades. All those programs would fit into the JOBS Act but not into some of the alternatives that are being discussed.

We need the JOBS Act now, and we think there is a great vehicle for it—which is the Higher Education Act—this year. A big fan of career and technical education is the chairman of that committee, Senator Lamar Alexander. He understands the need for us to provide the kind of skills training needed to fill the jobs that are out there that companies are desperate to fill. He sees this in his own State of Tennessee, where he has a lot of manufacturing jobs, including auto manufacturers that are looking for more skilled workers every day.

As we work to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, my hope is colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in ensuring that the JOBS Act is included in that. Let's be sure that we deal with the fairness issue here and that we have a sense of understanding about our economy and what the needs are right now.

A lot of that need is in skills and the kind of skills that the JOBS Act would provide. It just makes too much sense.

If we make career and technical education a priority and if we enact the JOBS Act I discussed today, we are going to help tens of thousands of our young people be able to achieve their dreams, whatever they are, and to have better opportunities. Just as important, we are going to be able to help our economy—help to ensure that here in the United States we have a growing economy where we have better tax policy, better regulation policy, and also, for the workers, ensure that the companies don't pick up and move because they don't have the workforce. Compa-

nies tell me in Ohio: You know, ROB, we could do what we are doing here in other places, and not just Indiana, which is next to Ohio, but maybe India.

We don't want that. We want to have the workforce that is needed to be able to keep these good jobs and keep these companies here in this country, to ensure that we can keep moving in a positive direction, and, again, to ensure that Ohioans can develop the skills they need to grow in the career of their choice and to fulfill their potential in life.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CHILDCARE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that I know is on the minds of many, many Americans, especially folks who are in the middle class or who are struggling to get to the middle class, and that is the issue of childcare.

I think most of us in this Chamber agree that all children born in this country have a light inside of them. For some children, that light will shine very brightly without a lot of help as they have innate abilities or they have circumstances they are born into for which they don't need a lot of help from public policy or from programs or from legislation. Yet there are a lot of children who have a light inside of them that can burn to the full measure of its potential if we do our job. When I say "our job," I mean the job of elected officials. I think it is the job of every elected official at every level of government and of those who work with them to do everything they can to make sure that the light inside of every child burns as brightly as at least the full measure of his or her potential.

We know, just by way of one example in the context of childcare, that affordable, high-quality childcare enables parents to work so they can support their families. Also, quality, affordable healthcare helps give children the early learning experiences they need to develop and succeed in school. When children learn more and it is early in life, they will earn more much later in their lives. That connection between learning and earning isn't just a rhyme; all the research shows that there is a direct connection. When that child learns at a younger age because of early education and quality childcare and so many other strategies, we are all better off. Not only is that child better off in his or her family, but we are all better off. We will have a higher skilled workforce; we will have a more productive workforce; and we will grow and be able to out-compete any country in the world if we invest in early learning.

Unfortunately, we know the challenges. The cost of childcare has increased by 25 percent in just the last decade, which has created significant

financial strains for those same middle-class families. According to data from Child Care Aware, which is in my home Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the average cost of full-time, center-based childcare is about \$11,560 for an infant and about \$8,712 for a 4-year-old. This is about 12 percent of a married couple's annual income in Pennsylvania, and it is nearly 46 percent of a single parent's annual income—46 percent. That is not sustainable. That is not a number that anyone should be satisfied with. Frankly, I am not sure that 12 percent of the annual income for a two-parent family is sustainable. We should get that number into the single digits. The bill I will talk about in a moment seeks to do that.

Just this past week, when we were all back in our States and were able to travel for the better part of a week, I had the chance to get to six childcare centers in cities across Pennsylvania, and I spoke to more than 25 families who shared their stories about their struggles. The struggle, of course, in this case, was the struggle to afford high-quality childcare.

I was in Philadelphia, Pottstown, Gettysburg, Verona, Erie, and Reading. If you had charted those cities on a map, you would have literally gone from the furthest corner of the southeastern part of our State, which is Philadelphia, to the most remote, northwestern corner of the State, in Erie. I went to communities below Erie and to the northeast as well—so literally every corner of the State. Across those communities, we heard a lot of the same challenges, a lot of similar stories.

For example, one single mom in Philadelphia told us recently what, I think, is emblematic of what is happening in a lot of communities:

I struggle every day to make ends meet. I am not eligible for any public assistance, so I juggle my bills just to make ends meet. I have to become very creative in making sure that I pay my mortgage, utilities, and childcare.

Then she goes on from there to write:

Then I decide if I can pay for anything in addition to that, such as healthcare, food, necessities for my child or my home. I knew I would not be able to afford childcare. Luckily, I have the support of loved ones in my life who support me when I fall short. Most do not have this.

Then this single mother goes on to write the following:

All of my family and friends struggle to pay for childcare because we are middle class individuals who make too much money to qualify for childcare assistance or any other programs, but we also don't make enough money to actually afford childcare out of pocket. Oftentimes, we have to choose a childcare based off of a price and not based off of the quality of education they will provide our children at the childcare facility.

Notice what she wrote at the end there. She is making a decision about the childcare she will provide for her children based off only one consideration—the price. It is not based on the quality.

Therein lies the problem that we have to try to solve. If we have millions and millions of families—middle class or who are struggling to get to the middle class—making childcare determinations based solely on the cost, we will all be in trouble over time. That is not what we should be doing. It doesn't mean the price will not be a challenge for so many, and it doesn't mean the price will be irrelevant, but if they are not able to find quality childcare that is affordable, that child will be worse off over time; that community will be; and the rest of us will be. We will not have the high-skilled workforce that we need. We will not be able to compete and win the battle across the world that we need to win, and that is the battle to create the highest skilled workforce in the world and to maintain that advantage.

When I was in Gettysburg this past week, I heard from two parents who had adopted two children, one of whom has significant medical issues and has been in and out of the hospital. They have struggled to find a childcare center that is able to handle the behavioral and developmental needs of their children. The father, who is a small business owner, has had to make adjustments to his work schedule and sell off some of his business assets to make ends meet. He has had to choose between paying for his own health insurance or that of his children. He has had to give up his own insurance to ensure there will never be a lapse in coverage for his children. He makes too much money to qualify for childcare subsidies but lives with constant anxiety over his financial situation.

Part of his testimony and that of his wife was very emotional because of the stress and the pressure on that family—the stress and pressure of the healthcare itself and also of the stress and pressure because of the cost of childcare.

I was grateful he was willing to share his story. In a public setting, it is not easy to talk about the burdens that you live with every day in order to push a policy forward so as to make life better for another family. Like a lot of these parents, I was grateful they were willing to help us better understand those struggles so that we could better propose good policy.

We also heard from a single mom who works long hours as she tries to advance and work her way up the corporate ladder. Prior to her current circumstance, she was waitressing and barely making \$11,000 a year. When she was hardly making any income, she was able to make ends meet with the assistance of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and CCIS, which is our State's childcare program that helps families. Now she is in a different circumstance. She works full time—an achievement that she is quite proud of. She is no longer eligible, though, for these programs because her income has gone up.

The good news is her income went up, and she has a full-time job. The bad

news is that it knocks her out of eligibility. She must pay the full cost of childcare and be away from her children. She doesn't know what she will do during the summer as she will need to increase the time her children are in care, which will result in higher costs when her children are on summer break. So that is the dilemma she faces—working harder and getting a full-time job but then not being able to afford help. She needs help from us as well.

I spoke with a mother in Verona, PA, in Allegheny County, who has an 11-month-old child who is in childcare now. Though both she and her husband work full time, they struggle to afford care. They would like to grow their family, but, again, the cost of childcare is their main reason for not doing so. We know that childcare helps children grow and learn, that it helps parents work and provide for their families, and that it helps employers retain a productive workforce. Yet families across the country are unable to afford care. That is why it is so important that we increase Federal investments in early learning and childcare.

For example, in fiscal year 2018, the Childcare and Development Block Grant program was funded at \$5.27 billion here in Washington. That was an 83-percent increase—the largest single increase in the history of the program. In that same year—the last budget year, the last appropriations year—Head Start received a little more than \$9.8 billion, and that was \$610 million more than the program got in 2017.

Both of those were good results. It doesn't happen every day in Washington, we know. These historic, bipartisan investments were continued in the last fiscal year. So there was an increase in this last fiscal year. It was nowhere near the increase of the prior year, but there were extra dollars to sustain funding. These investments are already making an impact in States like Pennsylvania and across our country, but there is so much more unmet need and so much more work to be done. So it is good news on the block grants, but, of course, that is not the whole story on childcare.

I am pushing for both increased funding for the next fiscal year—the one we are working on now, 2020—as well as two bills that will make high-quality childcare accessible and affordable for low- and middle-income families. The first is the Childcare for Working Families Act, and the second is the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit Enhancement Act. I will discuss them in that order.

The Childcare for Working Families Act would first provide direct financial assistance to working parents to help pay for childcare and early learning to ensure that no parents would pay more than 7 percent of their household incomes for childcare if they earn less than 150 percent of the State's median income.

These numbers change between median household income and median

family income, but if you are just looking at the median household income in Pennsylvania, it is about \$57,000. If you do 150 percent of that, you will be into the eighties, roughly. We don't know where the line would be drawn for certain State by State, but if we can come up with a way to keep costs below 7 percent for folks who are in that income range—say, roughly, in the low eighties down—we can help these families do two things: go to work while providing childcare for their children that is quality childcare and also be able to afford it.

The second part of the bill—and it is, basically, three parts—will be universal access to high-quality preschool programs for 3- and 4-year-olds.

The third part would be to improve workforce compensation by ensuring that all childcare workers are paid a living wage and that early childhood educators are provided parity with elementary schoolteachers who have similar credentials and experience. So there are three parts to that bill—childcare help, early learning help with preschool, and paying the workforce more.

People in both parties say it all the time: We care about our children, and we care about our seniors. But sometimes the folks who provide care to both groups of Americans—those who provide care and early learning to children and those who provide skilled care in nursing homes and other settings to seniors—are among the lowest paid workers in our society. So we say we prioritize those Americans, and we don't lift them up with the kind of workforce that they sometimes need.

The second bill I will talk about—and then I will wrap up—I will soon reintroduce with Congressman DAVIS. It is a proposal to improve and expand an existing tax credit which we know as the child and dependent care tax credit, not to be confused with the child tax credit, the tax credit you may have eligibility for if you have a child. This one focuses on child care and dependent care.

This bill would help families pay for childcare expenses by doing the following: first, increasing the maximum amount of the credit from just over 1,000 bucks—about \$1,050—to \$3,000 per child, and it could go up as high as 6,000 if you have more than one child, making the full tax credit available to most working families with incomes up to \$120,000 a year.

Now, under the current law, that credit starts to lose its value once you hit only \$15,000 of income—not that high of an income level. By raising that number, you are going to get a lot more middle-class families that will benefit, as well as some trying to get to the middle class.

The third part of the bill would ensure that lower income families are better able to benefit from the credit by making it fully refundable.

You have this strange dynamic where folks are working and they have an in-

come, but the income is rather limited and the credit is not refundable. So they don't get anything back from that credit. So it isn't worth much to them in many cases.

The last part of the bill will retain the value over time by indexing the benefits of this child and dependent care tax credit and raise those thresholds based upon inflation.

In conclusion, I think it is pretty simple. All children deserve the chance to learn and succeed, regardless of where they are born or regardless of their family's income. That is why it is so important to make sure that all families have access to high-quality, affordable childcare and early learning. Together, these proposals will help to bring us closer to that reality and, I would argue, closer to meeting our obligation as elected officials at every level of government—this being the Federal level in the Congress, the Senate and the House, meeting our obligation to make sure that the light inside of every child burns to the full measure and shines to the full measure of its potential.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week the Senate conveyor belt of President Trump's judicial nominees grinds on. So far, the President and the Senate leader have an unprecedented pace in confirming Federal judges, especially powerful Federal appellate judges. They seem to have no higher priority.

What is a little weird about this is that nearly 90 percent of Trump's appellate judges and both of his Supreme Court Justices are members of the so-called Federalist Society. On the Supreme Court, Kavanaugh, Gorsuch, Alito, and Thomas all are members. Now, that is a little weird.

What is really weird is that through this Federalist Society vehicle, big, special interests are picking Federal judges.

In effect, there are three Federalist Societies. The first one most lawyers know from law school. It is, for the most part, a debating society made up of like-minded aspiring lawyers drawn to conservative ideas and judicial doctrine. They organize seminars and invite academics, judges, and attorneys to speak. That is terrific—no problem there.

The second Federalist Society is the parent organization of the campus debating society—a sort of highbrow think tank seeking to further conservative and libertarian judicial principles. It convenes fancy forums with

conservative legal luminaries, from Supreme Court Justices to big-name politicians, to renowned legal scholars. It issues newsletters and produces podcasts and policy recommendations. Through this, they hope to "reorder priorities within the legal system" and create a network of members "that extends to all levels of the legal community."

I disagree pretty strongly with the system of law they are trying impose, and their funding is suspiciously obscure, but this debate is a fine thing to have—so no objection there either.

Then there is the third Federalist Society. This one doesn't have much in common with the law school debating society, and it certainly doesn't operate like your run-of-the-mill Washington think tank. This Federalist Society is the nerve center for a complicated apparatus that does not care much about conservative principles like judicial restraint or originalism or textualism.

This Federalist Society is the vehicle for powerful, commercial, and industrial interests that seek not simply to "reorder" the judiciary but to acquire control of the judiciary to benefit their interests. This third Federalist Society understands the fundamental power of the Federal judiciary to rig the system in favor of its donor interests and, as the Kavanaugh confirmation so clearly illustrated, is willing to go to drastic lengths to secure that power.

I am here today to talk about that third Federalist Society.

The story of the third Federalist Society is partly the story of a man named Leonard Leo, the society's executive vice president.

Mr. Leo is now the most influential person shaping America's Federal judiciary. Don't be surprised if you are listening and you have never heard of him. He has never been elected. He is not accountable to any voter. Instead, he is the front man for interests that want to use the Federalist Society and its surrounding network of front groups and PR shops and think tanks to acquire control over our courts.

Renowned court watcher Jeffrey Toobin describes Mr. Leo as "Trump's subcontractor on the selection of Supreme Court Justices." More accurately, Mr. Leo is the subcontractor for a network of big corporate interests and front groups.

In the summer of 2016, it was Leo who delivered the list of potential nominees to fill the vacancy left by the death of Antonin Scalia and the blocking of Merrick Garland. It was Mr. Leo who was involved in the Trump transition, helping to conduct outreach to potential Supreme Court picks, including Neil Gorsuch.

Mr. Leo even orchestrated a \$1 million donation to Trump's inauguration.

The role of the Federalist Society has been confirmed by President Trump's own legal counsel, Don McGahn.

McGahn told a Federalist Society gathering in 2017:

Our opponents of judicial nominees frequently claim the President has outsourced his selection of judges. That is completely false. I have been a member of the Federalist Society since law school, still am, so, frankly, it seems like it's been in-sourced.

Ha-ha, so funny.

The Federalist Society does more than pick the judges. They prepare them. They study the prospective nominees and the Senators who will ask them questions. They gather murder boards for nominees to practice for confirmation hearings.

Mr. Leo is proud of this operation. During the confirmation hearing for Justice Neil Gorsuch, Leo told Toobin, with considerable satisfaction:

You know, the hearings matter so much less than they once did. We have the tools now to do all the research. We know everything they have written. We know what they've said. There are no surprises.

In the Judiciary Committee, we see the result over and over—meaningless committee hearings where nominees parrot empty words about applying law to fact and respecting precedent. Then, once confirmed and on the bench, those nominees deliver dependably for the partisan and corporate donors behind this Federalist Society operation.

It is bad enough that judicial selection has been outsourced—or insourced—to a partisan private entity. Worse is how nontransparent this all is. It is hard to find out who is behind it. It is a very nontransparent problem, but here is what we have been able to piece together. The evidence is that the Federalist Society is funded by massive, secret contributions from corporate rightwing groups that have big agendas before the courts.

In 2017 the Federalist Society took \$5.5 million via an entity called DonorsTrust. DonorsTrust has as its sole purpose to launder the identities of donors to other groups so that Americans don't know who the real backers are of the groups. It is an identity removal machine for big donors. Through the hard work of investigators, journalists, and researchers, we have learned that the Koch brothers are among the largest—if not the largest—contributors to DonorsTrust. The Federalist Society's total annual budget is about \$20 million. So this \$5.5 million in funding, laundered through DonorsTrust, provides more than a quarter of its entire budget.

Other shadowy corporate and rightwing organizations also donate millions to the Federalist Society. In 1 year, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, a rightwing trust, gave over \$3 million to the Federalist Society. Koch Industries, several other Koch-network foundations and trusts, and nearly a dozen wholly anonymous donors have given over \$100,000 each to the Federalist Society. Tax documents from 2014, uncovered by the New York Times, show a donation of more than \$2 million from the Mercer family, the secretive donors who helped start Breitbart News and bankrolled the Trump campaign.

How do we know that these groups have a big agenda before the courts? We know that because they also fund a fleet of front groups that file so-called amicus briefs before courts signaling what results the big donors want. The Kochs, the Bradleys, the Mercers, and their ilk spend millions to pursue an anti-regulation, anti-union, and anti-environment agenda, and they use the Federalist Society to stock the judiciary with judges who will rule their way.

The Federalist Society, as a 501(c)(3) organization, is supposed to stay out of politics. The Judicial Crisis Network is a 501(c)(4) organization which can, and does, get involved in politics. The Judicial Crisis Network is led by a disciple of Leonard Leo's, a former clerk for ultraconservative Justice Clarence Thomas. The Judicial Crisis Network has been described in conservative circles as "Leonard Leo's PR organization—nothing more and nothing less." When it comes time to muscle a judicial nominee through Senate confirmation, the Judicial Crisis Network swings into action. Media campaigns, attack ads, and big spending—that is the Judicial Crisis Network's world.

Like its Federalist Society partner, the Judicial Crisis Network gets massive sums of dark money, and it spends massively too. It spent \$7 million on campaigns to block Merrick Garland from getting a hearing on his nomination to the Supreme Court, and it spent \$10 million to support the nomination—blockade enabled—of Neil Gorsuch—and \$7 million and \$10 million—and it received one anonymous donation of \$17.9 million. One donor gave \$17.9 million to this operation to influence our judiciary. I will say that we need to know who that donor was. Because we are in the minority, we are going to be spurned and rejected if we try to get that information. On the House side, where they have the power of subpoena, we need to pursue that. It ought to be public information when one donor can spend nearly \$18 million to influence the selection of a U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

Judicial Crisis Network then got \$23 million from something called the Wellspring Committee. You will have to forgive some of this because it is very obscure. These are peculiar groups that aren't involved in any ordinary business or regular activity. The Wellspring Committee is a Virginia-based entity with ties to—you guessed it—Leonard Leo, and the Judicial Crisis Network then promised to spend as much on the Kavanaugh nomination as they had for Gorsuch.

Add to this mix of peculiarly funded and obscure organizations the BH Group, a shell corporation that gave \$1 million to Donald Trump's inaugural. The BH Group received over \$1 million in something called consulting fees in 2017 from something else called the Judicial Education Project. Who is Judicial Education Project? The Judicial Education Project is—guess what—the

501(c)(3) side of the Judicial Crisis Network. Why does a shell corporation give money to the Trump inaugural and also serve as a consultant to a legal organization fighting for the confirmation of specific Justices? What consulting did they do? Was there any consulting done at all? Great questions. Leonard Leo probably knows the answer. In 2018, he told the Federal Elections Commission that the BH Group was his employer.

While this apparatus may be complex and difficult to track, its goal is simple. Don McGahn explained it succinctly: "Regulatory reform and judicial selection are . . . deeply connected." Translated, that means that the Federalist Society's goal is to pack the judiciary through judicial selection with judges who will deliver what is called regulatory reform, an extreme anti-regulation, anti-union, anti-environment agenda for those corporatist Federalist Society funders.

Let me give you two examples.

The Senate just confirmed Neomi Rao to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. Rao comes right out of the deep bog of special interest dark money. Her bio appears on the Federalist Society website, along with the list of 26 times she has been featured at Federalist Society events—26 auditions, as one might describe them.

This is a person confirmed for the DC Court of Appeals who has never been a judge. She has never even tried a case. What has she done? She served as the Trump administration's point person for tearing down Federal regulations as head of the White House's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. Among her greatest hits was taking one of Scott Pruitt's proposed regulatory rollbacks for the climate-change driving-gas methane from the oil and gas industry and tipping that regulation even further in favor of fossil fuel polluters. Out-Pruitting Scott Pruitt for the fossil fuel industry is hard to do. That may have been another audition for the court.

Rao also funded the so-called Center for the Study of the Administrative State at George Mason University's Antonin Scalia Law School, which is devoted to conjuring ways to roll back as many regulations affecting these corporations as possible and is funded by these same secretive groups.

I asked Ms. Rao about the funders of her center at the Scalia Law School. She claimed in her answers—and, by the way, I will add that these were questions for the record—written questions that she had time to consider, review, and respond to. This was not a surprise attack of an unprepared witness at a hearing. She had weeks to answer. She claimed in her answers that, to the best of her knowledge, her organization had not received any money from the Federalist Society, from Koch Family Foundations, or from anonymous funders.

Well, that was simply not true. A Virginia open records request revealed

that an anonymous donor and the Charles Koch Foundation donated \$30 million earmarked specially for her organization. Guess whose interests she has been conveyed onto the DC Circuit Court of Appeals to protect.

Now consider the case of *Kisor v. Wilkie*, a case currently before the Supreme Court. It hasn't gotten much attention. On its face, it is about an obscure administrative law doctrine, but *Kisor* has been described as a "stalking horse for much larger game"—whether administrative agencies can continue to have the independence they need to regulate in the public interests. At stake could be the power of the EPA to protect our air and water, of the Department of Labor to continue to protect workers in the workplace, and of the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect investors against financial fraud.

Many corporations hate regulation. The problem is regulations are pretty popular. Politicians may talk about cutting redtape, but their constituents really like clean air and clean water. They want safe workplaces and the peace of mind that their investments are sound.

That is where judges like Neomi Rao and cases like *Kisor* come in. For decades we have operated in a system where Congress passes laws and administrative Agencies fill in the details and implement those laws using their regulatory power and their time, patience, and expertise to deal with complex problems. It has worked extremely well. Cases like *Kisor*, however, slowly chip away at that system, shifting more and more power from expert regulatory agencies to courts and to courts filled with more and more judges like Neomi Rao.

The Daily Beast influence reporter Jay Michaelson wrote:

Sometimes thought of as a legal association, the Federalist Society is actually a large right-wing network that grooms conservative law students still in law school (sponsoring everything from free burrito lunches to conferences, speakers, and journals), links them together, mentors them, finds them jobs, and eventually places them in courts and in government.

Within this Federalist Society is this operation I have described, funded by dark money and designed to remake our judiciary on behalf of a distinct group of very wealthy and powerful, anonymous funders. Add to that the dark money funding the so-called Judicial Crisis Network. Add to that the dark money funding the amicus briefs telling these judges what to do. Then look at the outcomes when the Federalist Society-selected appointees get a majority on the court. It is not a pretty sight.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President. I wish to honor the distinguished career of Bruce Benson, the outgoing president of the University of Colorado. Through his tenacity and hard work, Bruce made the university and the State of Colorado a better place. CU is one of the Nation's great universities, and Bruce's contributions, including the record-breaking growth in research funding, have made it a source of statewide pride.

Bruce would admit that he was originally reluctant to take the job and with good reason: He had already enjoyed a long and fruitful career in politics, philanthropy, and business. However, those experiences and relationships were exactly what made Bruce so effective. As only he could, Bruce was able to use these experiences to further CU's standing as one the Nation's prominent public universities and research institutions.

Under Bruce's leadership, the university's research funding reached record levels, surpassing \$1 billion during the last academic year. This money allowed for critical research in biotechnology, healthcare, energy, and aerospace and a number of other fields. Additionally, CU had its 6 best fundraising years during his time at the helm, including a record \$440.4 million between 2017 and 2018. All the while, Bruce guided efforts to implement operational efficiencies, cut bureaucracy, and improve business practices at the university. Successes like these solidify Bruce's legacy and his commitment to the future of Colorado. It is worth noting that he is retiring as the longest serving CU president in more than half a century.

Bruce has always been a tireless champion for Colorado's young people. He worked to make the DPS Foundation into the great civic organization it is today. He has also done extraordinary work at Children's Hospital Colorado.

Bruce has consistently worked to change the lives of children and students across the State of Colorado, from the youngest of kids to college graduates. I know I speak on behalf of all of Colorado when I say that we are all grateful for his service.●

RECOGNIZING TREASURE COUNTY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of congratulating Treasure County for 100 years of

as one of Montana's 56 counties.

Although one of the least populous counties in Montana, Treasure boasts many historic buildings that incorporate the rich history of Big Sky Country from the Yucca Theater with its beautiful Spanish mission style architecture that provided hope and entertainment during the Great Depression, to the 1950s contemporary style courthouse in Hysham. With a population less than a thousand, Treasure County's rich lands provide a bounty for ranchers and farmers alike.

Treasure County is an important part of Montana's cherished history and remains a vital part of our State's landscape. I congratulate the folks down in Treasure County on celebrating 100 years of excellence in local government.●

REMEMBERING SAMYA STUMO

• Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, Samya Stumo, a University of Massachusetts Amherst graduate and resident of Sheffield, MA, was tragically killed aboard Ethiopian Airlines flight 302. Samya, just 24 years old, was a champion of social justice, with a goal of revolutionizing global health. Her undergraduate fieldwork in Peru challenged unjust social services; her master's work in Europe gave a voice to marginalized patient groups living with viral hepatitis; and, most recently, she was working to disrupt the status quo in global health systems to help countries achieve universal healthcare coverage. She strove for all people and patients to be treated as human beings, particularly in context of their culture, family, and individuality. She was a beacon of hope for Massachusetts, the Nation, and all of the lives she has touched.●

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI'S BICENTENNIAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION WEEK

• Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the University of Cincinnati on their bicentennial celebration honoring 200 years of extraordinary research.

In January of 1819, two colleges were chartered by the state of Ohio: the Medical College of Ohio and Cincinnati College. Both are predecessors to today's University of Cincinnati. The opening enrollment of Cincinnati College was roughly 70 students. Today, the University of Cincinnati has an enrollment of nearly 46,000 students, making it one of the largest universities in the Nation. UC stands as a Carnegie Research 1 university, with a living alumni base of more than 300,000; a world-acclaimed campus and top programs in music, health, design, science, and more; plus a \$4.2 billion economic impact in its tristate region of Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana.

Next week, UC will be celebrating its Bicentennial Research and Innovation Week. The week will be honoring UC's

past 200 years of extraordinary research by showcasing the impactful, imaginative, and innovative work researchers at UC are doing today. Examples of the research and innovation that will be highlighted during the week include demonstrations of connected autonomous vehicles, presentations on infrastructure to share data in smart secure cities, pitches by student-inventors and entrepreneurs, discussions on partnerships needed for the goal of ending the opioid epidemic, highlights from experts in bioinformatics, neuroscience, and engineering at the University of Cincinnati and its affiliated institutions and how they are pushing the boundaries of clinical and data sciences, and more.

UC is proud of the broad societal impacts the work of our researchers have had on Cincinnati, the region, and beyond. Congratulations to the University of Cincinnati for 200 years of research and innovation excellence.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. RONNIE BOOTH

● Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, today I would like to celebrate the service and achievements of Dr. Ronnie Booth of Anderson, SC, as he approaches his retirement from his position as president of the Tri-County Technical College. Dr. Booth, named the third president of TCTC in 2003, has spent the last 16 years helping to advance the college and community to its current level of unprecedented success.

Under Dr. Booth's leadership, Tri-County Technical College launched three community campuses, three workforce training centers, and economic development, technology and student success centers among different campuses. He also created and established the Bridge to Clemson and Connect to College Programs, which both help to create pathways for students of all backgrounds to achieve their goals. Other notable achievements during his tenure include the Technical Career Pathways Program, Michelin Manufacturing Scholars Program, and I-BEST Manufacturing Pathway Program.

Just this past year, Tri-County Technical College earned the top ranking in student success, transfer, and graduation among the 16 colleges in the SC Technical College System and also ranked in the top 1 percent nationally for successful transfers to 4-year colleges and universities. Community support and partnerships have also grown under Dr. Booth's leadership, truly uniting the Tri-County area for the better.

Dr. Booth has also been an active and engaged citizen, being a member of multiple professional associations, civic groups, and State and national boards. His commitment to improving the lives of his students, school, and community cannot be understated, and he has surely made a resoundingly positive impact on countless students, faculty, staff, and community mem-

bers. His leadership will not be soon forgotten, and I congratulate him on his successes, as well as wish him good fortune, on this next chapter in his life.●

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL B. OLDEN

● Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate of the accomplishments of a fellow Mississippian, Mr. Samuel B. Olden of Yazoo City, on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

Mr. Olden is from Yazoo City, the gateway to the Mississippi Delta, where he was born in 1919, to a family of Mississippi planters. Throughout his youth, he read widely in the B.S. Ricks Memorial Library, the oldest privately funded public library in the State, which greatly contributed to his personal development and admission into the University of Mississippi in Oxford. There, he received a B.A. and M.A., reportedly conversed with Nobel Prize winning author William Faulkner, and was ultimately recruited to Washington, DC, to serve at the Department of State. Prior to American involvement in World War II, Mr. Olden was sent abroad as the Vice Consul at our embassy in Quito, Ecuador, from 1941 to 1943. Upon his return, Mr. Olden enlisted in the U.S. Navy, serving from 1943-46 at posts ranging from Shanghai, China, to Paris, France.

After the war, Mr. Olden transited the north Atlantic on a Liberty ship. A fellow naval officer noted Mr. Olden's fortitude during this stormy passage. While tending to his ailing father back in Mississippi, he received a letter from Washington asking him to consider defending our Nation's freedom, in a third, essential way. Mr. Olden returned to the District of Columbia, where he was invited to join the newly formed Central Intelligence Group. Commencing in 1947, Mr. Olden spent 2 years in the group's Washington office, followed by 3 years in Vienna, Austria, where he defended freedom and democracy against Communist aggression.

Following a decade in public service, Mr. Olden entered the private sector, where he employed his experience abroad for Mobil Oil. From 1952-1957, he was posted in East and West Nigeria, British and French Cameroon, The Congo, Chad, and Gabon. He joined Mobil's government relations department in 1957 and returned to New York. There, he attained Observer status at the United Nations and strode the halls with Adlai Stevenson and Eleanor Roosevelt. Later, he went abroad once more to serve as general manager of Mobil's affiliates in Tunisia, Algeria, Peru, and Spain.

By 1974, Mr. Olden was fluent in English, French, German, and Spanish. He had connections around the world. And where did he go? He chose to retire to the finest place that he had ever lived: Yazoo City. There, he owned and operated a cattle ranch for 15 years, while continuing to pursue his passion

for the study of history. He was twice a board member and was elected president of the Mississippi Historical Society, served 15 years on the State Committee for the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi, and founded the Yazoo Historical Society's remarkable museum, housed in the same Triangle Center building where he had attended elementary school. Even in his 90s, he established and helped to fund the Yazoo Memorial Literary Walkway, which stretches between the Triangle Center and the B.S. Ricks Library. The walkway memorializes more than 100 Yazooan authors that include former U.S. House Minority Leader and U.S. Senator John Sharp Williams, literary critic and editor Henry Herschel Brickell, Governor Haley Reeves Barbour, beloved writers Willie Morris, Teresa Nicholas, Ruth Williams, John Langston, and Caroline Langston Jarboe, and educator Henry Mitchell Brickell. His large collection of pre-Columbian ceramics is now on display in the Mississippi Museum of Art in Jackson and is the focus of Yumi Park's book "Mirrors of Clay."

This remarkable man has served his Nation as a diplomat, military officer, and emissary, during wars hot and cold. He served the world in the energy industry as a global businessman of distinction. He returned to his hometown and has continued to serve his State, his university, and his community as a historian, educator, and philanthropist even into the tenth decade of his life. His friends across the Nation and around the world celebrate with him today.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:08 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. 297. An act to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1388. An act to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 252. An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of Colonel in the regular Army.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1388. An act to take lands in Sonoma County, California, into trust as part of the reservation of the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 297. An act to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 27, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 252. An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of colonel in the regular Army.

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-703. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-704. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

EC-705. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mandipropamid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9987-25-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-706. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department

of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Scrapie in Sheep and Goats" (Docket No. APHIS-2007-0127) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-707. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Milk Marketing Orders - Amending the Class 1 Skim Milk Price Formula" ((7 CFR Part 1000) (Docket No. AMS-DA-18-0096)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-708. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pecans Grown in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas; Revision of Reporting Requirements" ((7 CFR Part 986) (Docket No. AMS-SC-18-0019; SC18-986-1 FR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-709. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fresh Fruits, Vegetables and Other Products Inspection, Certification and Standards and Processed Fruits and Vegetables, Processed Products Thereof, and Certain Other Processed Food Products; Removal of Power of Attorney and Other Administrative Changes" ((7 CFR Parts 51 and 52) (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0106)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Budget Blueprint of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2020 received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations.

EC-711. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2018 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments from the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, the three national security laboratory directors, and the Commander, United States Strategic Command (OSS-2019-0274); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-712. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense support activities provided under the authority of Section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2004 during fiscal year 2018 (OSS-2019-0206); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-713. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of additional time required to complete a report that includes a fuel budget justification for the upcoming fiscal year, an appendix of all Department of Defense operational energy initiatives, the Joint Staff's progress in implementing the energy Key Performance Parameter, and certification of the Presi-

dent's Budget as adequate for the implementation of the Department's Operational Energy Strategy; to the Committees on Armed Services; and Appropriations.

EC-714. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Syria effective March 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-715. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a request relative to issuing a travel restriction on senior officials' travel to Iraq effective March 19, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-716. 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 during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-717. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of six (6) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-718. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of eleven (11) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-719. 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 "Program to Encourage Public and Community Service (PACS)" (RIN0790-AK44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-720. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order with respect to transnational criminal organizations that takes additional steps to deal with the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-721. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-722. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-723. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-724. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-725. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-726. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of an item not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-727. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-728. A communication from the Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) for the Bank's Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Performance Plan and Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Performance Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-729. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2019 annual report relative to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-730. A communication from the Program Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards" (RIN1557-AD84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-731. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN2590-AB01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-732. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities" (RIN2590-AB02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-733. A communication from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to OFAC Regulations to Incorporate the List of Foreign Financial Institutions Subject to Correspondent Account or Payable-Through Account Sanctions (CAPTA List)" (31 CFR Parts 561 and 566) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-734. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Freedom of Information Act Regulations" ((RIN1505-AC35) (31 CFR Part 1)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-735. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Capital Plan Rule" (RIN7100-AF41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-736. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FAST Act Modernization and Simplification of Regulation S-K" (RIN3235-AM00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-737. 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 "Adjustments of Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts for 2019" (RIN2501-AD90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-738. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Amended Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Power Act" ((RIN1902-AF56) (Docket No. RM19-4-000)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-739. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf - Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment" (RIN1014-AA42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-740. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the New Soo Locks Project, Sault Ste. Marie, Chippewa County, MI; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-741. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Attainment Plan for Indianapolis and Terre Haute SO₂ Nonattainment Areas" (FRL No. 9991-10-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-742. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Status Implementation Plans; California; Plumas County; Moderate Area Plan for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9990-34-Region 9) received during adjournment of the

Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-743. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California" (FRL No. 9990-13-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-744. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methylene Chloride; Regulation of Paint and Coating Removal for Consumer Use Under TSCA Section 6(a)" (FRL No. 9989-29-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-745. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units; Technical Amendments" (FRL No. 9991-32-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-746. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Minor Sources Infrastructure Requirement for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter, 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide NAAQS" (FRL No. 9991-40-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-747. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "March 2019 Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-748. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "March 2019 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-749. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Under Section 851 Relating to Investments in Stock and Securities" (RIN1545-BN55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-750. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Distributions of Stocks and Securities of a Controlled Corporation" (Rev. Rul. 2019-09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-751. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2019 Calendar Year

Resident Population Figures” (Notice 2019-19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-752. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treasury Decision (TD): Amendments to the Low-Income Housing Credit Compliance-Monitoring Regulations” (RIN1545-BL39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-753. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treasury Decision (TD): Amendments to the Low-Income Housing Credit Utility Allowance Regulations” (RIN1545-BM28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-754. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treasury Decision (TD): Qualified Business Income Deduction” (RIN1545-BO71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-755. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists of .50 caliber machine guns to Oman for the Royal Oman Guard in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-053); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-756. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists of 5.56mm semi-automatic assault rifles to Oman for the Omani Ministry of Defense in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-087); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-757. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the United Kingdom and Israel to support the development, integration, and support for F-135 propulsion system Organizational Level (O-Level) maintenance field training, and services for the operation and sustainment of the F-35 Lightning II air systems operated by the Ministry of Defense in Israel in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-057); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-758. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the manufacture of significant military equipment and the export of technical data and defense services, to Israel and Germany to support the manufacture of firearm components, parts, accessories, barrels, blank receivers, and breech mechanisms in

the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-101); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-759. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019-0013 - 2019-0020); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-760. A communication from the Chairman, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, “Thirteenth Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) of 1996”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-761. A communication from the 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 during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-762. 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 “Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption; Extension of Compliance Dates for Subpart E” ((21 CFR Part 112) (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0921)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-763. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Guidance for the Standard Borrower Defense to Repayment Applications; Institutions’ Notifications of Financial Responsibility Events, Actions, and Conditions; Implementation of the Class Action Bans and Predispute Arbitration Agreements Provisions; the Repayment Rate and Financial Protection Disclosures Provisions of the 2016 Borrower Defense to Repayment Regulations” (RIN1840-AD19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-764. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program” (RIN1840-AD19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-765. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act of 1965, as Amended by every Student Succeeds Act: Providing Equitable Services to Eligible Private School Children, Teachers, and Families” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-766. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy for the position of Director, Office of Personnel Management, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-767. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-768. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, six (6) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-769. A communication from the Vice Chairman and Executive Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of five recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 70th Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-770. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office’s Congressional Budget Justification and Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2020, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-771. A joint communication from the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Operating Officer of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Armed Forces Retirement Home Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2018”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-772. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2017 FAIR Act inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-773. A communication from a Senior Official Performing the Duties of the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “U.S. Department of Homeland Security Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2018-2020”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-774. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-563, “Short-Term Rental Regulation Act of 2018”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Economic Report of the

President together with the 2019 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Joint Economic Committee.

EC-776. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-777. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Victims Compensation Fund established by the Witness Security Reform Act of 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-778. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report from the Attorney General to Congress relative to the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-779. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Acquisition Regulation: Construction and Architect-Engineer Contracts" (RIN2900-AQ18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-780. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fertility Counseling and Treatment for Certain Veterans and Spouses" (RIN2900-AP94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-781. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Assistance Provided to Foreign Aviation Authorities for FY 2018"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-782. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2018"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-783. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "ELDT: Commercial Driver's License Upgrade from Class B to Class A" (RIN2126-AC05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-784. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Affairs; Antarctic Marine Living Resources Convention Act; Correction" (RIN0648-BI40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-785. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Anchorage Ground; Sabine Pass, TX" ((RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2018-0388)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-786. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones: Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX" ((RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0156)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-787. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zones: Missouri River, Mile Markers 450-625, St. Joseph, MO to Omaha, NE" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0177)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 21, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-788. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991" (CG Docket No. 02-278) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-789. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunication Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Withdrawal of the Commission as an Accounting Authority in the Maritime Mobile and Maritime Mobile-Satellite Radio Services" ((FCC 18-186) (IB Docket No. 98-96)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-790. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund" ((FCC 19-8) (WC Docket No. 10-90)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-791. 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; Cookeville and Franklin, TN" (MB Docket No. 18-383) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-792. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "LPTV; TV Translator, and FM Broadcast Station Reimbursement" ((FCC 19-21) (MB Docket No. 18-214)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 22, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-16. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to enact the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 85

Whereas, under current federal law, survivors of deceased military members are required to forfeit part or all of their Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) annuity when they are awarded Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA); and

Whereas, currently, surviving spouses of active duty or retired members who died of a service-connected cause are required to forfeit \$1 of their SBP annuity for each \$1 received in DIC; and

Whereas, for FY 2017, the DIC was approximately \$1,258 a month and the offset wiped out most if not all of the SBP annuity compensation for a majority of survivors; and

Whereas, Congress has made attempts to help some of the survivors by: raising the lump-sum death gratuity for deaths after October 2001; ending the offset for survivors who remarry after age 57; and authorizing the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance (SSIA), a modest monthly rebate (approximately \$310 in FY 2017) to SBP-DIC recipients subjected to this in equity; and

Whereas, however, the lump-sum increases in the death gratuity did not help the 95% of survivors whose spouses died of service-caused conditions before 2001. Forced to forfeit \$1,258 a month, survivors view the SSIA \$310 rebate a poor effort at restitution. Moreover, SSIA will terminate in May 2018 if Congress does not extend the allowance; and

Whereas, in 2007, the Veterans Disability Benefits Commission was asked to review the inequity and determined that when military service causes a member's death, the DIC should be paid in addition to the SBP annuity, not subtracted from it; and

Whereas, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act is currently pending in Congress to: repeal certain provisions that require the offset of money paid in DIC compensation from SBP annuities for surviving spouses under 60 years of age; prohibit requiring repayment of certain monies previously paid to SBP recipients; and require certain military departments to pay the dependent children when there is no eligible surviving spouse; and

Whereas, this House urges Congress to pass the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act because our nation's military personnel risk their lives to defend our nation and our freedoms and they should be able to trust that the benefits they designate for their families will be provided; Now, therefore, be it

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges Congress to enact the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, every member of Congress elected from this State, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

POM-17. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Alaska urging the implementation of an oil and gas leasing program in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, in 16 U.S.C. 3143 (sec. 1003 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act), the United States Congress reserved the right to permit oil and gas development and production in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas, in 16 U.S.C. 3142 (sec. 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act), the United States Congress authorized nondrilling exploratory activity in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas sec. 20001 of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-97) requires the United States Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer a competitive oil and gas program for the leasing, development, and production of oil and gas in and the transportation of oil and gas from the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas sec. 20001 of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-97) requires that at least two lease sales be held by December 22, 2024, and that each sale offer for lease at least 400,000 acres of land with the highest hydrocarbon potential in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, allowing for up to 2,000 acres of federal land, which is equivalent to .01 percent of the 19,300,000-acre refuge, to be covered by production and support facilities; and

Whereas the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge contains an estimated 7,687,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil and 7,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas; and

Whereas the exploration, development, and production of oil and gas in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is predicted to generate 1,430 direct jobs and 6,350 indirect jobs annually and 2,480 direct jobs and 10,100 indirect jobs at peak employment; and

Whereas the estimated potential government revenue from petroleum development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge through 2050, including revenue to the North Slope Borough, the state, and the federal government from royalties, income taxes, production taxes, and property taxes, equals \$104,673,000,000; and

Whereas oil and gas development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has the potential to extend the life of the Trans Alaska Pipeline System and increase throughput, which has declined from a peak of 2,033,000 average barrels of oil a day in 1988 to 509,000 average barrels of oil a day in 2018; and

Whereas oil and gas development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has the potential to enhance the economic viability of the proposed Alaska liquefied natural gas project; and

Whereas oil and gas development on the coastal plain would strengthen national security and provide long-lasting benefits to the national economy by creating thousands of jobs nationwide, generating billions of dollars in government revenue, providing affordable energy to American consumers, and decreasing dependence on foreign energy; and

Whereas advances in extended-reach and directional drilling technology have greatly reduced the impact area of oil and gas activities, including shrinking the average drilling pad size by more than 80 percent, from 65 acres in 1970 to 12 acres today, and increasing the subsurface area accessible from modern drilling pads by nearly 2,000 percent, from three square miles in 1970 to 60 square miles today; and

Whereas safe and responsible oil and gas exploration, development, and production has been demonstrated by over 50 years of

activity on the North Slope of Alaska without adverse effects on the environment or wildlife populations; and

Whereas the state continues to strive to ensure the ongoing health and productivity of the Porcupine and Central Arctic caribou herds and the protection of land, water, and wildlife resources during the exploration and development of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas polling consistently shows Alaskans overwhelmingly support responsible oil and gas development in the non-wilderness portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas, while most Alaskans support development in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, many do so with the understanding that the state's workforce will be used to the maximum extent possible if the leasing program moves forward; and

Whereas the proposed leasing area of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is located in the North Slope Borough, and many residents of the borough, the population of which is predominantly Inupiat, are supportive of development in the non-wilderness area of the coastal plain; be it further *Resolved*, That the Alaska State Legislature requests that the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, implement an oil and gas leasing program in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as outlined in the December 2018 Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature requests that the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, in its consideration of action alternatives outlined in the December 2018 Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program Draft Environmental Impact Statement, take into account the long history of safe and responsible oil and gas development on Alaska's North Slope, the enormous benefits development of oil and gas resources in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would bring to the state and the nation, the advances in oilfield technology that continue to shrink the impact area of oil and gas activities, and the support of residents from the North Slope Borough and across the North Slope of Alaska for oil and gas development in a portion of the coastal plain.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable David Bernhardt, Acting United States Secretary of the Interior; Brian Steed, Deputy Director for Policy and Programs, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior; and Nicole Hayes, Coastal Plain Project Manager, Bureau of Land Management Alaska State Office, U.S. Department of the Interior.

POM-18. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota urging the United States Congress to amend the Social Security Act to allow states to provide Medicaid services to those persons presumed innocent in jail awaiting trial; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, a basic principle of the United States judicial system is that citizens charged with a crime are innocent until proven guilty; and

Whereas, the United States and South Dakota have determined it is right and appropriate to care for our most vulnerable citizens through the Medicaid program, and county jails are populated by many persons

who have serious medical conditions and mental illnesses or who are the parents of small children who qualify for Medicaid benefits; and

Whereas, the jail population in the United States is growing faster than the prison population, and approximately two-thirds of the jail population consists of those pending disposition who remain innocent until proven guilty and who are currently not being treated equally to those awaiting trial who obtained bail and were released awaiting adjudication; and

Whereas, providing Medicaid services to persons in jail pending disposition will increase the likelihood that the provision of services is continuous once the person reenters the community; and

Whereas, section 1905(a)(A) of the Social Security Act prevents South Dakota from providing Medicaid services to persons in jail pending disposition who would otherwise be covered under the Medicaid policies of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the Ninety-Fourth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the Legislature requests the United States Congress to amend the Social Security Act to allow states to provide Medicaid services to those persons presumed innocent in jail awaiting trial; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services, and to the South Dakota congressional delegation.

POM-19. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to support a woman's right to make reproductive health decisions and access reproductive healthcare; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, January 22, 2019, marks the 46th anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113, which affirmed that every woman has a fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions and to decide whether to [end or to continue pregnancy,] *continue a pregnancy or obtain an abortion*, and is an occasion deserving of acknowledgment; and

Whereas, *Roe v. Wade* has been the cornerstone of women's ability to control their reproductive lives, allowing every woman in the United States the right to decide when, if, and with whom to have children, and how many children to [have:] *have, and has helped facilitate women's economic and societal participation in the United States*; and

[Whereas, Women's ability to control their reproductive lives has helped and facilitated their participation in the economic and social life of our nation; and]

Whereas, *In the years prior to the Roe v. Wade* [has drastically reduced the maternal mortality rate for women terminating their pregnancies in the United States. In the years prior to the] decision, illegal abortion accounted for approximately 17 percent of all reported deaths attributable to pregnancy and childbirth, and many women were severely injured as a result of "back alley" abortion procedures; and

Whereas, Interference with a woman's right to choose causes women to be forced into illegal and dangerous abortions, as they often were in the United States before the

Roe v. Wade decision. Many women are forced to make these decisions today in countries where abortion is illegal and where the unsafe methods of illegal abortion lead to 13 percent of global maternal deaths annually, or eight maternal deaths every hour. Many survivors of an illegal abortion suffer serious and often permanent injuries; hour; and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade continues to protect the health and freedom of women throughout the United States; States. *National peer-reviewed studies show abortion is a safe medical procedure, increasingly provided through outpatient medication, that nearly one in four women in the United States will access;* and

Whereas, Roe v. Wade is in serious jeopardy of being overturned or further eroded due to President Donald J. Trump's appointment of two justices to the United States Supreme Court who have a record of being hostile to a woman's constitutional right to choose, Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh; and

Whereas, States are passing legislation that creates barriers to abortion and there are more than a dozen cases limiting abortion rights that could be considered by the Supreme Court of the United States; and

Whereas, Providers of sexual and reproductive healthcare are still under serious, unrelenting attack for providing essential information and services, such as abortion, as evidenced by bomb threats, arson, and vandalism in California and the fact that death threats against abortion providers doubled, and incidents of clinic obstruction tripled, nationally from 2016 to 2017 alone; and

Whereas, The State of California stands in strong support of every woman's fundamental right, as confirmed in Roe v. Wade, to make [her own] decisions regarding [her pregnancy;] pregnancy and commits to boldly advance access to sexual and reproductive healthcare within our state; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate urges the President of the United States and the United States Congress to express their support for a woman's fundamental right to control her own reproductive decisions, as well as their support for access to comprehensive reproductive [health care,] healthcare, including the services provided by Planned Parenthood; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Majority Leader of the Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-20. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to pass legislation that would automatically enroll veterans for benefits in the Department of Veterans Affairs system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION No. 163

Whereas, Military service members are eligible for a range of United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) benefits when they are discharged; and

Whereas, Currently, those benefits may include, but are not limited to, healthcare, disability, educational, and employment benefits; and

Whereas, Under the VA pre-discharge program, members are encouraged to apply for each type of benefit they are entitled to prior to their discharge, and are encouraged to work with an accredited representative during this process; and

Whereas, While helpful to service members, the process in place for applying for each type of benefit can be time consuming and burdensome, especially as service members are making a transition from military to civilian life; and

Whereas, Providing for automatic enrollment of veterans for the VA benefits they are entitled to would facilitate this process and ease the transition to civilian life: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges the United States Congress to pass legislation to automatically enroll veterans for benefits they are entitled to in the United States Department of Veterans Affairs system.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President of the United States Senate, the Senate Minority Leader, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the House Minority Leader, the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, and each member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-21. A petition from a citizen of the State of Ohio relative to tax incentives on American-made automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RUBIO for the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

*David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 886. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 887. A bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 888. A bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 889. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost

of college; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 890. A bill to authorize the Sergeant at Arms to protect the personal technology devices and accounts of Senators and covered employees from cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide payment of Medal of Honor special pension under such title to the surviving spouse of a deceased Medal of Honor recipient, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 892. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 893. A bill to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED):

S. 894. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 895. A bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 896. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for reform in the operations of the Office of Government Ethics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. JONES):

S. 897. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "family farmer"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 898. A bill to designate the Manhattan Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the "Margaret Cochran Corbin Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 899. A bill to limit the authority of the President to modify duty rates for national security reasons and to limit the authority of the United States Trade Representative to impose certain duties or import restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 900. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bozeman, Montana, as the "Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. JONES):

S. 901. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 902. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of physicians in the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 903. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish advanced nuclear goals, provide for a versatile, reactor-based fast neutron source, make available high-assay, low-enriched uranium for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 904. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 905. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 906. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 907. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 908. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEE, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 909. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 910. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 911. A bill to require the installation of secondary cockpit barriers on existing aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 912. A bill to require certain public housing agencies to absorb port-in housing choice vouchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 913. A bill to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering health insurance coverage to disclose cost information to enrollees in such plans or coverage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 914. A bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and to require the establishment of a National Water Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 915. A bill to prohibit public companies from repurchasing their shares on the open market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 916. A bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 917. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to prepare and submit periodic reports to Congress on the role of telecommunications in hate crimes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 918. A bill to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services on broadband networks without authorization from Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 919. A bill to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commer-

cial space activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 920. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make available parental leave benefits to parents following the birth or adoption of a child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HIRONO):

S.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 122. A resolution observing the 25th Anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 123. A resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 124. A resolution condemning the March 15, 2019, terrorist attacks in Christchurch, New Zealand, offering sincere condolences to all of the victims and their families, and expressing and standing in solidarity with the people and Government of New Zealand; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. Res. 125. A resolution designating March 2019 as "National Women's History Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 126. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, as “Public Schools Week”; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 127. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the treatment of core seasonal industries affected by antidumping or countervailing duty investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 164, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 175

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognition Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

S. 365

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 365, a bill to amend section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to require the Secretary of Defense to initiate investigations and to provide for congressional disapproval of certain actions, and for other purposes.

S. 373

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 567, a bill clarifying that it is United States policy to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 665

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to reduce the number of preventable deaths and injuries caused by override crashes, to improve motor carrier and passenger motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to limit experimentation on cats.

S. 726

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 741

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 741, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for cost sharing for oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the cost sharing provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the soldiers of the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as “Merrill’s Marauders”, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 750

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 750, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 753

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 771

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 771, a bill to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to require an annual report on the cybersecurity of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in logging operations from child labor laws.

S. 824

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 824, a bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 854, a bill to require human rights certifications for arms sales, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to repeal the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to establish an oil spill response and prevention grant program and provide for advances from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the application of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund financing rate, and for other purposes.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 879, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of not more than 9 justices.

S. RES. 78

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 78, a resolution recognizing the national debt as a threat to national security.

S. RES. 85

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 85, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals, a leading advocate and service provider for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, and their caregivers and families.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

S. RES. 118

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from

Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 118, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2019, as "Military Retiree Appreciation Day", and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 890. A bill to authorize the Sergeant at Arms to protect the personal technology devices and accounts of Senators and covered employees from cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I, along with my colleague Senator COTTON from Arkansas, am introducing the Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act to defend the integrity of American democracy by providing cybersecurity protection for the personal accounts and electronic devices of Senators and key members of their staff.

In 2016, hackers working for the Russian government broke into a range of targets, including the network of the Democratic National Committee and the email account of Senator Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign manager, John Podesta. These widely publicized breaches are only the tip of the iceberg. These hacks are widely known today because the emails stolen from these accounts were subsequently weaponized and used as part of a campaign to influence the outcome of several elections—most publicly, the presidential race between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, but also U.S. House of Representatives races in Illinois, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM also reported that his campaign's email was successfully compromised.

While the Russian hacks in 2016 were a watershed moment, these are merely the most visible and disruptive examples of foreign intelligence services

using offensive cyber capabilities to target those involved in our political process. Senior officials from the 2008 Obama and McCain presidential campaigns have publicly confirmed that both organizations were compromised by hackers. In 2017, the media reported that then-White House Chief of Staff John Kelly's personal cell phone had been compromised, possibly for as long as ten months before the malware was discovered. And in 2018, media reports revealed that the personal email accounts of senior congressional staffers had been targeted by the notorious Russian hacking group "Fancy-Bear." These and other events clearly demonstrate the unique threats faced by Senators and their staff. Unfortunately, as I revealed in a letter to Senate leadership last year, the Sergeant At Arms (SAA), which is responsible for the Senate's cybersecurity, informed me that it currently lacks the authority to use official Senate resources to protect the personal devices and accounts of Senators and key Senate staff, even when those staff are being targeted by foreign governments.

Senators COTTON and I are not alone in recognizing the seriousness of this national security threat.

Last year, then-Director of the National Security Agency Admiral Michael Rogers acknowledged in a letter to me that personal devices and accounts of senior U.S. government officials "remain prime targets for exploitation." Likewise, in written responses to post-hearing questions from the Senate Intelligence Committee last year, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats wrote that "[t]he personal accounts and devices of government officials can contain information that is useful for our adversaries to target, either directly or indirectly, these officials and the organizations with which they are affiliated." The Appropriations Committee also noted last year in its report accompanying the 2019 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill that it "continues to be concerned that Senators are being targeted for hacking and cyber attacks, especially via their personal devices and accounts."

Currently, Senators and staffers are expected to protect their own devices and accounts from foreign government hackers. This is absurd. Senators and the vast majority of their staff are not cybersecurity experts, and certainly do not have the training our resources to defend themselves from sophisticated foreign intelligence agencies. Eric Rosenbach, who was formerly Chief of Staff to Secretary of Defense Ash Carter, has endorsed the bill we are introducing today, observing that "Senators and their staff should not be expected to go toe to toe with some of the most sophisticated adversaries in cyberspace; authorizing protection of personal accounts is a critical component of our cyber defense efforts." Likewise, Bruce Schreier, a noted cybersecurity expert has also endorsed the bill, stating that "[i]t is ludicrous to expect in-

dividual senators and their staff to defend themselves from spies and hackers. Hostile foreign intelligence services do not respect the arbitrary line between work and personal technology. As such, the U.S. government must extend its defensive cyber perimeter to include legislators' personal devices and accounts."

Our bill would permit the SAA to provide voluntary, opt-in cybersecurity assistance to Senators and key Senate staff to secure their personal devices and accounts. Any Senate staffer would be eligible to receive assistance, provided that the Senator employing them determines that they are highly vulnerable to cyber attacks and information collection because of their position in the Senate.

There is precedent for extending cybersecurity protection to the personal devices of government officials. Section 1645 of the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act permits the Secretary of Defense to provide personal device cybersecurity assistance to officials whom the secretary "determines to be highly vulnerable to cyber attacks and hostile information collection activities because of the positions occupied by such personnel in the Department." The Senate Cybersecurity Protection Act is also similar to provisions included in the intelligence authorization bill approved by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in 2018, which would permit the Director of National Intelligence to protect the personal devices and accounts of high-risk staff in the intelligence community.

Passage of this common sense, bipartisan legislation would provide Senators and their staff with much-needed protection for their personal accounts and devices, and with them, the integrity of American democracy. I thank my colleague Senator COTTON for his efforts on this bill, and hope the Senate will promptly pass this vital legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED):

S. 894. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 894

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) White supremacists and other far-right-wing extremists are the most significant domestic terrorism threat facing the United States.

(2) On February 22, 2019, a Trump Administration United States Department of Justice official wrote in a New York Times op-ed that "white supremacy and far-right extremism are among the greatest domestic-security threats facing the United States. Regrettably, over the past 25 years, law enforcement, at both the Federal and State levels, has been slow to respond. . . Killings committed by individuals and groups associated with far-right extremist groups have risen significantly."

(3) An April 2017 Government Accountability Office report on the significant, lethal threat posed by domestic violent extremists explained that "[s]ince September 12, 2001, the number of fatalities caused by domestic violent extremists has ranged from 1 to 49 in a given year." The report noted: "[F]atalities resulting from attacks by far right wing violent extremists have exceeded those caused by radical Islamist violent extremists in 10 of the 15 years, and were the same in 3 of the years since September 12, 2001. Of the 85 violent extremist incidents that resulted in death since September 12, 2001, far right wing violent extremist groups were responsible for 62 (73 percent) while radical Islamist violent extremists were responsible for 23 (27 percent)."

(4) An unclassified May 2017 joint intelligence bulletin from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security found that "white supremacist extremism poses [a] persistent threat of lethal violence," and that White supremacists "were responsible for 49 homicides in 26 attacks from 2000 to 2016 . . . more than any other domestic extremist movement".

(5) Fatal terrorist attacks by far-right-wing extremists include—

(A) the August 5, 2012, mass shooting at a Sikh gurdwara in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 6 members of the gurdwara;

(B) the April 13, 2014, mass shooting at a Jewish community center and a Jewish assisted living facility in Overland Park, Kansas, in which a neo-Nazi shot and killed 3 civilians, including a 14-year-old teenager;

(C) the June 8, 2014, ambush in Las Vegas, Nevada, in which 2 supporters of the far-right-wing "patriot" movement shot and killed 2 police officers and a civilian;

(D) the June 17, 2015, mass shooting at the Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 9 members of the church;

(E) the November 27, 2015, mass shooting at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in which an anti-abortion extremist shot and killed a police officer and 2 civilians;

(F) the March 20, 2017, murder of an African-American man in New York City, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who reportedly traveled to New York "for the purpose of killing black men";

(G) the May 26, 2017, attack in Portland, Oregon, in which a White supremacist allegedly murdered 2 men and injured a third after the men defended 2 young women whom the individual had targeted with anti-Muslim hate speech;

(H) the August 12, 2017, attack in Charlottesville, Virginia, in which a White supremacist killed one and injured nineteen after driving his car through a crowd of individuals protesting a neo-Nazi rally, and of which former Attorney General Jeff Sessions said, “It does meet the definition of domestic terrorism in our statute.”;

(I) the July 2018 murder of an African-American woman from Kansas City, Missouri, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who reportedly bragged about being a member of the Ku Klux Klan;

(J) the October 24, 2018, shooting in Jeffersonton, Kentucky, in which a White man allegedly murdered 2 African Americans at a grocery store after first attempting to enter a church with a predominantly African-American congregation during a service; and

(K) the October 27, 2018, mass shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in which a White nationalist allegedly shot and killed 11 members of the congregation.

(6) In November 2018, the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its annual hate crime incident report, which found that in 2017, hate crimes increased by approximately 17 percent, including a 23-percent increase in religion-based hate crimes, an 18-percent increase in race-based crimes, and a 5-percent increase in crimes directed against LGBT individuals. The total number of reported hate crimes rose for the third consecutive year. The previous year’s report found that in 2016, hate crimes increased by almost 5 percent, including a 19-percent rise in hate crimes against American Muslims; additionally, of the hate crimes motivated by religious bias in 2016, 53 percent were anti-Semitic. Similarly, the report analyzing 2015 data found that hate crimes increased by 6 percent that year. Much of the 2015 increase came from a 66-percent rise in attacks on American Muslims and a 9-percent rise in attacks on American Jews. In all three reports, race-based crimes were most numerous, and those crimes most often targeted African Americans.

(7) On March 15, 2019, a White nationalist was arrested and charged with murder after allegedly killing 50 Muslim worshippers and injuring more than 40 in a massacre at the Al Noor Mosque and Linwood Mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand. The alleged shooter posted a hate-filled, xenophobic manifesto that detailed his White nationalist ideology before the massacre. Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern labeled the massacre a terrorist attack.

(8) In January 2017, a right-wing extremist who had expressed anti-Muslim views was charged with murder for allegedly killing 6 people and injuring 19 in a shooting rampage at a mosque in Quebec City, Canada. It was the first-ever mass shooting at a mosque in North America, and Prime Minister Trudeau labeled it a terrorist attack.

(9) On February 15, 2019, Federal authorities arrested U.S. Coast Guard Lieutenant Christopher Paul Hasson, who was allegedly planning to kill a number of prominent journalists, professors, judges, and “leftists in general”. In court filings, prosecutors described Lieutenant Hasson as a “domestic terrorist” who in an email “identified himself as a White Nationalist for over 30 years and advocated for ‘focused violence’ in order to establish a white homeland.”.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Director” means the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(2) the term “domestic terrorism” has the meaning given the term in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code, except that it

does not include acts perpetrated by individuals associated with or inspired by—

(A) a foreign person or organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) an individual or organization designated under Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); or

(C) a state sponsor of terrorism as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), or section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(3) the term “Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee” means the committee within the Department of Justice tasked with assessing and sharing information about ongoing domestic terrorism threats;

(4) the term “hate crime incident” means an act described in section 245, 247, or 249 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631);

(5) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(6) the term “uniformed services” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 4. OFFICES TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICES TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, INVESTIGATE, AND PROSECUTE DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) DOMESTIC TERRORISM UNIT.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Unit in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, which shall be responsible for monitoring and analyzing domestic terrorism activity.

(2) DOMESTIC TERRORISM OFFICE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Office in the Counterterrorism Section of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice—

(A) which shall be responsible for investigating and prosecuting incidents of domestic terrorism; and

(B) which shall be headed by the Domestic Terrorism Counsel.

(3) DOMESTIC TERRORISM SECTION OF THE FBI.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Section within the Counterterrorism Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall be responsible for investigating domestic terrorism activity.

(4) STAFFING.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each ensure that the offices authorized under this section in their respective agencies shall have adequate staff to perform the required duties.

(b) JOINT REPORT ON DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit a joint report authored by the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the domestic terrorism threat posed by White supremacists and neo-Nazis, including White supremacist

and neo-Nazi infiltration of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and the uniformed services; and

(B)(i) in the first report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that have occurred in the United States since April 19, 1995; and

(ii) in each subsequent report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that occurred in the United States during the preceding year; and

(C) a quantitative analysis of domestic terrorism for the preceding year, including the number of—

(i) domestic terrorism related assessments initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of assessments from each classification and subcategory;

(ii) domestic terrorism-related preliminary investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of preliminary investigations from each classification and subcategory, and how many preliminary investigations resulted from assessments;

(iii) domestic terrorism-related full investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of full investigations from each classification and subcategory, and how many full investigations resulted from preliminary investigations and assessments;

(iv) domestic terrorism-related incidents, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, the number of deaths and injuries resulting from each incident, and a detailed explanation of each incident;

(v) Federal domestic terrorism-related arrests, including the number of arrests from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each arrest;

(vi) Federal domestic terrorism-related indictments, including the number of indictments from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each indictment;

(vii) Federal domestic terrorism-related prosecutions, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each prosecution;

(viii) Federal domestic terrorism-related convictions, including the number of convictions from each classification and subcategory, and a detailed explanation of each conviction; and

(ix) Federal domestic terrorism-related weapons recoveries, including the number of each type of weapon and the number of weapons from each classification and subcategory.

(3) HATE CRIMES.—In compiling a joint report under this subsection, the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall, in consultation with the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, review each hate crime incident reported during the preceding year to determine whether the incident also constitutes a domestic terrorism-related incident.

(4) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public websites of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) DOMESTIC TERRORISM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee, which shall—

(1) meet on a regular basis, and not less regularly than 4 times each year, to coordinate with United States Attorneys and other key public safety officials across the country to promote information sharing and ensure an effective, responsive, and organized joint effort to combat domestic terrorism; and

(2) be co-chaired by—

(A) the Domestic Terrorism Counsel authorized under subsection (a)(2)(B);

(B) a United States Attorney or Assistant United States Attorney;

(C) a member of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice; and

(D) a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) **FOCUS ON GREATEST THREATS.**—The domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall focus their limited resources on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding year required under subsection (b).

SEC. 5. TRAINING TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) **REQUIRED TRAINING AND RESOURCES.**—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall review the anti-terrorism training and resource programs of their respective agencies that are provided to Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, including the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Program that is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice, and ensure that such programs include training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in understanding, detecting, deterring, and investigating acts of domestic terrorism and White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of law enforcement agencies. The domestic-terrorism training shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the quantitative analysis in the joint report required under section 4(b).

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—Any individual who provides domestic terrorism training required under this section shall have—

(1) expertise in domestic terrorism; and

(2) relevant academic, law enforcement, or other experience in matters related to domestic terrorism.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and once each year thereafter, the Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each submit an annual report to the committees of Congress described in section 4(b)(1) on the domestic terrorism training implemented by their respective agencies under this section, which shall include copies of all training materials used and the names and qualifications of the individuals who provide the training.

(2) **CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of each report, posted on the public website of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 6. COMBATING DOMESTIC TERRORISM THROUGH JOINT TERRORISM TASK FORCES AND FUSION CENTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The joint terrorism task forces of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and State, local, and regional fusion centers, as established under section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h), shall each, in coordination with the

Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee and the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4(a) of this Act—

(1) share intelligence to address domestic terrorism activities;

(2) conduct an annual, intelligence-based assessment of domestic terrorism activities in their jurisdictions; and

(3) formulate and execute a plan to address and combat domestic terrorism activities in their jurisdictions.

(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—The activities required under subsection (a) shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding year required under section 4(b).

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall establish an interagency task force to combat White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of the uniformed services.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 895. A bill to provide for a permanent extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 895

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Hospital Regulatory Relief Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS.

Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(x) **PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS.**—On and after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall continue to apply the enforcement instruction described in the notice of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services entitled ‘Enforcement Instruction on Supervision Requirements for Outpatient Therapeutic Services in Critical Access and Small Rural Hospitals for CY 2013’, dated November 1, 2012 (providing for an exception to the restatement and clarification under the final rulemaking changes to the Medicare hospital outpatient prospective payment system and calendar year 2009 payment rates (published in the Federal Register on November 18, 2008,

73 Fed. Reg. 68702 through 68704) with respect to requirements for direct supervision by physicians for therapeutic hospital outpatient services) and extended by section 1 of Public Law 113–198, section 1 of Public Law 114–112, section 16004(a) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255), and section 51007 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 115–123), and reinstated for calendar years 2018 and 2019 under the final rule entitled ‘Medicare Program: Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Systems and Quality Reporting Programs’ published on December 14, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 59216).”.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 899. A bill to limit the authority of the President to modify duty rates for national security reasons and to limit the authority of the United States Trade Representative to impose certain duties or import restrictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, today Senator CARPER and I introduced the Reclaiming Congressional Trade Authority Act of 2019. Enacting this bill would restore the role on Congress in overseeing international trade matters.

I have been outspoken against the abuse of executive authorities that have been delegated to the President. Congress has a Constitutional power to oversee international trade. We have recently seen an abuse of this power, as with other executive authorities. This bill would mandate expanded Congressional involvement in international trade decisions by requiring the Trump Administration—and future Administrations—to further analyze, communicate, and justify tariff actions to Congress. Congress would then review new tariffs and if the Administration used national security to justify the tariffs’ need, Congress would be required to approve them.

I am advocating for my colleagues to consider supporting this bill, especially as the damaging effects of the ongoing trade war continue. It’s time for Congress to step in and act on our Constitutional duty.

By Mr. Daines (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 900. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bozeman, Montana, as the “Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Daines. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 900

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF TRAVIS W. ATKINS DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC IN BOZEMAN, MONTANA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 300 North Willson

Avenue, Bozeman, Montana, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the “Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic” or the “Travis W. Atkins VA Clinic”.

(b) **REFERENCE.**—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the community-based outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 906. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to re-introduce the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act.” This legislation would update the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to phase out the use of harmful drift gillnets and replace them with more sustainable fishing gear. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator CAPITO, for once again co-leading this important bill.

Drift gillnets, which are approximately one to one and a half miles long, are intended to catch swordfish and thresher shark off the coast of California. Tragically, nearly 60 other species are frequently caught and killed in the nets, including dolphins, porpoises, whales, sea lions, and sea turtles. These are known as bycatch.

While some of these species can be sold, most are wastefully thrown back into the ocean either dead or seriously injured.

According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, these harmful nets account for 90% of whale and porpoise species killed in West Coast Fisheries. In the 1980s, Congress enacted legislation to end the domestic use of driftnets approximately 1.5 miles or longer. Under President George H.W. Bush, the United States entered binding international agreements banning such nets worldwide.

Driftnets are prohibited or are not utilized off the United States’ Atlantic and Gulf coasts as well as in Washington State, Oregon, Alaska, and Hawaii. Mexico permanently banned the use of these nets in the Gulf of California in 2017.

However, neither domestic nor international law currently includes the drift gillnets used in Federal waters off the coast of California to catch swordfish and thresher shark, despite their significant impact on protected marine life. This California-based fishery is the last place in the United States where these deadly driftnets are allowed.

Last year, the California legislature passed a bill, subsequently signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown, to phase out these large-mesh drift gillnets in State waters and establish a buyout program over a four-year period.

The State law requires the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to es-

tablish a voluntary “permit transition program” by March 2020 that will compensate fishermen during this transition process. California has already dedicated \$1 million for the program and another \$1 million is being sought through a public-private partnership.

Now that these nets are banned in State waters, our legislation to ban the nets in Federal waters is more timely than ever. The “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act” would phase out the use of drift gillnets over the five years after enactment. The bill also authorizes the Department of Commerce to assist fishermen in transitioning from driftnets to more sustainable gear types, which studies have shown actually increase profitability.

Updated fishing gear that could replace driftnets is available and has been successfully deployed in the Atlantic Ocean and in trials in the Pacific Ocean. Deep-set buoy gear, for example, allows fishermen to more accurately target swordfish and other marketable species in deep, cold water. The gear alerts fishermen immediately when they have fish on the line, so the fish can be retrieved and delivered to market quickly, thereby garnering a higher price.

In a 2016 poll, California voters overwhelmingly supported efforts to end the use of drift gillnets to catch swordfish, with 87 percent of those surveyed in a poll commissioned by The Pew Charitable Trusts agreeing that fishermen should use less harmful gear.

Our bill enjoys support from a wide range of commercial fishing companies, sportfishing groups, and environmental organizations, including: the American Sportfishing Association, the International Game Fish Association, Coastal Conservation Association of California, Yamaha USA, Okaiwa Corporation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, Oceana, Sea Legacy, and Mission Blue.

Our “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act” will protect valuable marine life unique to the West Coast, including several endangered species. This bill will also help fishermen to provide fresher, more profitable, and more sustainable seafood to American consumers.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act.” Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the Floor.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 908. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 908

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fluke Fairness Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Summer flounder is an important economic fish stock for commercial and recreational fishermen across the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic United States.

(2) The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) was reauthorized in 2006 and instituted annual catch limits and accountability measures for important fish stocks.

(3) That reauthorization prompted fishery managers to look at alternate management schemes to rebuild depleted stocks like summer flounder.

(4) Summer flounder occur in both State and Federal waters and are managed through a joint fishery management plan between the Council and the Commission.

(5) The Council and the Commission decided that each State’s recreational and commercial harvest limits for summer flounder would be based upon landings in previous years.

(6) These historical landings were based on flawed data sets that no longer provide fairness or flexibility for fisheries managers to allocate resources based on the best science.

(7) This allocation mechanism resulted in an uneven split among the States along the East Coast which is problematic.

(8) The fishery management plan for summer flounder does not account for regional changes in the location of the fluke stock even though the stock has moved further to the north and changes in effort by anglers along the East Coast.

(9) The States have been locked in a management system based on data collected from 1981 to 1989, thus, the summer flounder stock is not being managed using the best available science and modern fishery management techniques.

(10) It is in the interest of the Federal Government to establish a new fishery management plan for summer flounder that is based on current geographic, scientific, and economic realities.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

(2) **COUNCIL.**—The term “Council” means the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council established under section 302(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)).

(3) **NATIONAL STANDARDS.**—The term “National Standards” means the national standards for fishery conservation and management set out in section 301(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851(a)).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Commerce.

(5) **SUMMER FLOUNDER.**—The term “summer flounder” means the species *Paralichthys dentatus*.

SEC. 4. SUMMER FLOUNDER MANAGEMENT REFORM.

(a) **FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN MODIFICATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Council shall submit to the Secretary, and the Secretary may approve, a modified fishery management plan for the commercial management of summer flounder under title III of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 et seq.) or an amendment to such plan that—

(1) shall be based on the best scientific information available;

(2) establishes commercial quotas in direct proportion to the distribution, abundance, and location of summer flounder as reflected by fishery independent surveys conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service and State agencies;

(3) considers regional, coastwide, or other management measures for summer flounder that comply with the National Standards; and

(4) prohibits the establishment of commercial catch quotas for summer flounder on a State-by-State basis using historical landings data that does not reflect the status of the summer flounder stock, based on the most recent scientific information.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH THE COMMISSION.—In preparing the modified fishery management plan or an amendment to such a plan as described in subsection (a), the Council shall consult with the Commission to ensure consistent management throughout the range of the summer flounder.

(c) FAILURE TO SUBMIT PLAN.—If the Council fails to submit a modified fishery management plan or an amendment to such a plan as described in subsection (a) that may be approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall prepare and consider such a modified plan or amendment.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the approval under section 4 of a modified fishery management plan for the commercial management of summer flounder or an amendment to such plan, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of such modified plan or amendment that includes an assessment of whether such implementation complies with the National Standards.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 916. A bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 916

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mothers and Offspring Mortality and Morbidity Awareness Act” or the “MOMMA’s Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Every year, across the United States, 4,000,000 women give birth, about 700 women suffer fatal complications during pregnancy, while giving birth or during the postpartum period, and 70,000 women suffer near-fatal, partum-related complications.

(2) The maternal mortality rate is often used as a proxy to measure the overall health of a population. While the infant mortality rate in the United States has reached its lowest point, the risk of death for women in the United States during pregnancy, childbirth, or the postpartum period is higher than such risk in many other developed nations. The estimated maternal mortality

rate (per 100,000 live births) for the 48 contiguous States and Washington, DC increased from 18.8 percent in 2000 to 23.8 percent in 2014 to 26.6 percent in 2018. This estimated rate is on par with such rate for underdeveloped nations such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

(3) International studies estimate the 2015 maternal mortality rate in the United States as 26.4 per 100,000 live births, which is almost twice the 2015 World Health Organization estimation of 14 per 100,000 live births.

(4) It is estimated that more than 60 percent of maternal deaths in the United States are preventable.

(5) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the maternal mortality rate varies drastically for women by race and ethnicity. There are 12.7 deaths per 100,000 live births for White women, 43.5 deaths per 100,000 live births for African-American women, and 14.4 deaths per 100,000 live births for women of other ethnicities. While maternal mortality disparately impacts African-American women, this urgent public health crisis traverses race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, educational background, and geography.

(6) African-American women are 3 to 4 times more likely to die from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth compared to non-Hispanic White women.

(7) The findings described in paragraphs (1) through (6) are of major concern to researchers, academics, members of the business community, and providers across the obstetrical continuum represented by organizations such as March of Dimes; the Preeclampsia Foundation; the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; the Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine; the Association of Women’s Health, Obstetric, and Neonatal Nurses; the California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative; Black Women’s Health Imperative; the National Birth Equity Collaborative; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; EverThrive Illinois; the National Association of Certified Professional Midwives; PCOS Challenge; The National Polycystic Ovary Syndrome Association; and the American College of Nurse Midwives.

(8) Hemorrhage, cardiovascular and coronary conditions, cardiomyopathy, infection, embolism, mental health conditions, preeclampsia and eclampsia, polycystic ovary syndrome, infection and sepsis, and anesthesia complications are the predominant medical causes of maternal-related deaths and complications. Most of these conditions are largely preventable or manageable.

(9) Oral health is an important part of perinatal health. Reducing bacteria in a woman’s mouth during pregnancy can significantly reduce her risk of developing oral diseases and spreading decay-causing bacteria to her baby. Moreover, some evidence suggests that women with periodontal disease during pregnancy could be at greater risk for poor birth outcomes, such as preeclampsia, pre-term birth, and low birth weight. Furthermore, a woman’s oral health during pregnancy is a good predictor of her newborn’s oral health, and since mothers can unintentionally spread oral bacteria to their babies, putting their children at higher risk for tooth decay, prevention efforts should happen even before children are born, as a matter of pre-pregnancy health and prenatal care during pregnancy.

(10) The United States has not been able to submit a formal maternal mortality rate to international data repositories since 2007. Thus, no official maternal mortality rate exists for the United States. There can be no maternal mortality rate without streamlining maternal mortality-related data from

the State level and extrapolating such data to the Federal level.

(11) In the United States, death reporting and analysis is a State function rather than a Federal process. States report all deaths—including maternal deaths—on a semi-voluntary basis, without standardization across States. While the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has the capacity and system for collecting death-related data based on death certificates, these data are not sufficiently reported by States in an organized and standard format across States such that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is able to identify causes of maternal death and best practices for the prevention of such death.

(12) Vital statistics systems often underestimate maternal mortality and are insufficient data sources from which to derive a full scope of medical and social determinant factors contributing to maternal deaths. While the addition of pregnancy checkboxes on death certificates since 2003 have likely improved States’ abilities to identify pregnancy-related deaths, they are not generally completed by obstetrical providers or persons trained to recognize pregnancy-related mortality. Thus, these vital forms may be missing information or may capture inconsistent data. Due to varying maternal mortality-related analyses, lack of reliability, and granularity in data, current maternal mortality informatics do not fully encapsulate the myriad medical and socially determinant factors that contribute to such high maternal mortality rates within the United States compared to other developed nations. Lack of standardization of data and data sharing across States and between Federal entities, health networks, and research institutions keep the Nation in the dark about ways to prevent maternal deaths.

(13) Having reliable and valid State data aggregated at the Federal level are critical to the Nation’s ability to quell surges in maternal death and imperative for researchers to identify long-lasting interventions.

(14) Leaders in maternal wellness highly recommend that maternal deaths be investigated at the State level first, and that standardized, streamlined, de-identified data regarding maternal deaths be sent annually to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Such data standardization and collection would be similar in operation and effect to the National Program of Cancer Registries of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and akin to the Confidential Enquiry in Maternal Deaths Programme in the United Kingdom. Such a maternal mortalities and morbidities registry and surveillance system would help providers, academicians, lawmakers, and the public to address questions concerning the types of, causes of, and best practices to thwart, pregnancy-related or pregnancy-associated mortality and morbidity.

(15) The United Nations’ Millennium Development Goal 5a aimed to reduce by 75 percent, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality rate, yet this metric has not been achieved. In fact, the maternal mortality rate in the United States has been estimated to have more than doubled between 2000 and 2014. Yet, because national data are not fully available, the United States does not have an official maternal mortality rate.

(16) Many States have struggled to establish or maintain Maternal Mortality Review Committees (referred to in this section as “MMRC”). On the State level, MMRCs have lagged because States have not had the resources to mount local reviews. State-level reviews are necessary as only the State departments of health have the authority to request medical records, autopsy reports,

and police reports critical to the function of the MMRC.

(17) The United Kingdom regards maternal deaths as a health systems failure and a national committee of obstetrics experts review each maternal death or near-fatal childbirth complication. Such committee also establishes the predominant course of maternal-related deaths from conditions such as preeclampsia. Consequently, the United Kingdom has been able to reduce its incidence of preeclampsia to less than one in 10,000 women—its lowest rate since 1952.

(18) The United States has no comparable, coordinated Federal process by which to review cases of maternal mortality, systems failures, or best practices. Many States have active MMRCs and leverage their work to impact maternal wellness. For example, the State of California has worked extensively with their State health departments, health and hospital systems, and research collaborative organizations, including the California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative and the Alliance for Innovation on Maternal Health, to establish MMRCs, wherein such State has determined the most prevalent causes of maternal mortality and recorded and shared data with providers and researchers, who have developed and implemented safety bundles and care protocols related to preeclampsia, maternal hemorrhage, and the like. In this way, the State of California has been able to leverage its maternal mortality review board system, generate data, and apply those data to effect changes in maternal care-related protocol. To date, the State of California has reduced its maternal mortality rate, which is now comparable to the low rates of the United Kingdom.

(19) Hospitals and health systems across the United States lack standardization of emergency obstetrical protocols before, during, and after delivery. Consequently, many providers are delayed in recognizing critical signs indicating maternal distress that quickly escalate into fatal or near-fatal incidences. Moreover, any attempt to address an obstetrical emergency that does not consider both clinical and public health approaches falls woefully under the mark of excellent care delivery. State-based maternal quality collaborative organizations, such as the California Maternal Quality Care Collaborative or entities participating in the Alliance for Innovation on Maternal Health (AIM), have formed obstetrical protocols, tool kits, and other resources to improve system care and response as they relate to maternal complications and warning signs for such conditions as maternal hemorrhage, hypertension, and preeclampsia.

(20) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that nearly half of all maternal deaths occur in the immediate postpartum period—the 42 days following a pregnancy—whereas more than one-third of pregnancy-related or pregnancy-associated deaths occur while a person is still pregnant. Yet, for women eligible for the Medicaid program on the basis of pregnancy, such Medicaid coverage lapses at the end of the month on which the 60th postpartum day lands.

(21) The experience of serious traumatic events, such as being exposed to domestic violence, substance use disorder, or pervasive racism, can over-activate the body's stress-response system. Known as toxic stress, the repetition of high-doses of cortisol to the brain, can harm healthy neurological development, which can have cascading physical and mental health consequences, as documented in the Adverse Childhood Experiences study of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(22) A growing body of evidence-based research has shown the correlation between the stress associated with one's race—the

stress of racism—and one's birthing outcomes. The stress of sex and race discrimination and institutional racism has been demonstrated to contribute to a higher risk of maternal mortality, irrespective of one's gestational age, maternal age, socioeconomic status, or individual-level health risk factors, including poverty, limited access to prenatal care, and poor physical and mental health (although these are not nominal factors). African-American women remain the most at risk for pregnancy-associated or pregnancy-related causes of death. When it comes to preeclampsia, for example, which is related to obesity, African-American women of normal weight remain the most at risk of dying during the perinatal period compared to non-African-American obese women.

(23) The rising maternal mortality rate in the United States is driven predominantly by the disproportionately high rates of African-American maternal mortality.

(24) African-American women are 3 to 4 times more likely to die from pregnancy or maternal-related distress than are White women, yielding one of the greatest and most disconcerting racial disparities in public health.

(25) Compared to women from other racial and ethnic demographics, African-American women across the socioeconomic spectrum experience prolonged, unrelenting stress related to racial and gender discrimination, contributing to higher rates of maternal mortality, giving birth to low-weight babies, and experiencing pre-term birth. Racism is a risk-factor for these aforementioned experiences. This cumulative stress often extends across the life course and is situated in everyday spaces where African-American women establish livelihood. Structural barriers, lack of access to care, and genetic predispositions to health vulnerabilities exacerbate African-American women's likelihood to experience poor or fatal birthing outcomes, but do not fully account for the great disparity.

(26) African-American women are twice as likely to experience postpartum depression, and disproportionately higher rates of preeclampsia compared to White women.

(27) Racism is deeply ingrained in United States systems, including in health care delivery systems between patients and providers, often resulting in disparate treatment for pain, irreverence for cultural norms with respect to health, and dismissiveness. Research has demonstrated that patients respond more warmly and adhere to medical treatment plans at a higher degree with providers of the same race or ethnicity or with providers with great ability to exercise empathy. However, the provider pool is not primed with many people of color, nor are providers (whether student-doctors in training or licensed practitioners) consistently required to undergo implicit bias, cultural competency, or empathy training on a consistent, on-going basis.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING FEDERAL EFFORTS WITH RESPECT TO PREVENTION OF MATERNAL MORTALITY.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATES WITH RESPECT TO REPORTING MATERNAL MORTALITY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this section as the “Director”), in consultation with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall provide technical assistance to States that elect to report comprehensive data on maternal mortality, including oral, mental, and breastfeeding health information, for the purpose of encouraging uniformity in the reporting of

such data and to encourage the sharing of such data among the respective States.

(b) BEST PRACTICES RELATING TO PREVENTION OF MATERNAL MORTALITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) the Director, in consultation with relevant patient and provider groups, shall issue best practices to State maternal mortality review committees on how best to identify and review maternal mortality cases, taking into account any data made available by States relating to maternal mortality, including data on oral, mental, and breastfeeding health, and utilization of any emergency services; and

(B) the Director, working in collaboration with the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall issue best practices to hospitals, State professional society groups, and perinatal quality collaboratives on how best to prevent maternal mortality.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(c) ALLIANCE FOR INNOVATION ON MATERNAL HEALTH GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”), acting through the Associate Administrator of the Maternal and Child Health Bureau of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall establish a grant program to be known as the Alliance for Innovation on Maternal Health Grant Program (referred to in this subsection as “AIM”) under which the Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities for the purpose of—

(A) directing widespread adoption and implementation of maternal safety bundles through collaborative State-based teams; and

(B) collecting and analyzing process, structure, and outcome data to drive continuous improvement in the implementation of such safety bundles by such State-based teams with the ultimate goal of eliminating preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—In order to be eligible for a grant under paragraph (1), an entity shall—

(A) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

(B) demonstrate in such application that the entity is an interdisciplinary, multi-stakeholder, national organization with a national data-driven maternal safety and quality improvement initiative based on implementation approaches that have been proven to improve maternal safety and outcomes in the United States.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under paragraph (1) shall use such grant funds—

(A) to develop and implement, through a robust, multi-stakeholder process, maternal safety bundles to assist States and health care systems in aligning national, State, and hospital-level quality improvement efforts to improve maternal health outcomes, specifically the reduction of maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity;

(B) to ensure, in developing and implementing maternal safety bundles under subparagraph (A), that such maternal safety bundles—

(i) satisfy the quality improvement needs of a State or health care system by factoring in the results and findings of relevant data reviews, such as reviews conducted by a

State maternal mortality review committee; and

- (i) address topics such as—
- (I) obstetric hemorrhage;
- (II) maternal mental health;
- (III) the maternal venous system;
- (IV) obstetric care for women with substance use disorders, including opioid use disorder;

(V) postpartum care basics for maternal safety;

(VI) reduction of peripartum racial and ethnic disparities;

(VII) reduction of primary caesarean birth;

(VIII) severe hypertension in pregnancy;

(IX) severe maternal morbidity reviews;

(X) support after a severe maternal morbidity event;

(XI) thromboembolism;

(XII) optimization of support for breastfeeding; and

(XIII) maternal oral health; and

(C) to provide ongoing technical assistance at the national and State levels to support implementation of maternal safety bundles under subparagraph (A).

(4) MATERNAL SAFETY BUNDLE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “maternal safety bundle” means standardized, evidence-informed processes for maternal health care.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(d) FUNDING FOR STATE-BASED PERINATAL QUALITY COLLABORATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”), acting through the Division of Reproductive Health of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall establish a grant program to be known as the State-Based Perinatal Quality Collaborative grant program under which the Secretary awards grants to eligible entities for the purpose of development and sustainability of perinatal quality collaboratives in every State, the District of Columbia, and eligible territories, in order to measurably improve perinatal care and perinatal health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women and their infants.

(2) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Grants awarded under this subsection shall be in amounts not to exceed \$250,000 per year, for the duration of the grant period.

(3) STATE-BASED PERINATAL QUALITY COLLABORATIVE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “State-based perinatal quality collaborative” means a network of multidisciplinary teams that—

(A) work to improve measurable outcomes for maternal and infant health by advancing evidence-informed clinical practices using quality improvement principles;

(B) work with hospital-based or outpatient facility-based clinical teams, experts, and stakeholders, including patients and families, to spread best practices and optimize resources to improve perinatal care and outcomes;

(C) employ strategies that include the use of the collaborative learning model to provide opportunities for hospitals and clinical teams to collaborate on improvement strategies, rapid-response data to provide timely feedback to hospital and other clinical teams to track progress, and quality improvement science to provide support and coaching to hospital and clinical teams; and

(D) have the goal of improving population-level outcomes in maternal and infant health.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated \$14,000,000 per year for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

(e) EXPANSION OF MEDICAID AND CHIP COVERAGE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

(1) REQUIRING COVERAGE OF ORAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

(A) MEDICAID.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(4)—

(I) by striking “; and (D)” and inserting “; (D)”; and

(II) by inserting “; and (E) oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women (as defined in subsection (ee))” after “subsection (bb)”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ee) ORAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the term ‘oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women’ means dental services necessary to prevent disease and promote oral health, restore oral structures to health and function, and treat emergency conditions that are furnished to a woman during pregnancy (or during the 1-year period beginning on the last day of the pregnancy).”

“(2) COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS.—To satisfy the requirement to provide oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women, a State shall, at a minimum, provide coverage for preventive, diagnostic, periodontal, and restorative care consistent with recommendations for perinatal oral health care and dental care during pregnancy from the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.”

(B) CHIP.—Section 2103(c)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397cc(c)(5)(A)) is amended by inserting “or a targeted low-income pregnant woman” after “targeted low-income child”.

(2) EXTENDING MEDICAID COVERAGE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (5)—

(I) by inserting “(including oral health services for pregnant and postpartum women (as defined in section 1905(ee))” after “postpartum medical assistance under the plan”; and

(II) by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”; and

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”; and

(B) in subsection (l)(1)(A), by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”.

(3) EXTENDING MEDICAID COVERAGE FOR LAWFUL RESIDENTS.—Section 1903(v)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(v)(4)(A)) is amended by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”.

(4) EXTENDING CHIP COVERAGE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Section 2112(d)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 139711(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “60-day” and inserting “1-year”.

(5) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—

(A) MEDICAID.—Section 1902(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) During the period that begins on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ends on the date that is five years after such date of enactment, as a condition for receiving any Federal payments under section 1903(a) for calendar quarters occurring during such

period, a State shall not have in effect, with respect to women who are eligible for medical assistance under the State plan or under a waiver of such plan on the basis of being pregnant or having been pregnant, eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures under the State plan or waiver that are more restrictive than the eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures, respectively, under such plan or waiver that are in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”

(B) CHIP.—Section 2105(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) IN ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR TARGETED LOW-INCOME PREGNANT WOMEN.—During the period that begins on the date of enactment of this paragraph and ends on the date that is five years after such date of enactment, as a condition of receiving payments under subsection (a) and section 1903(a), a State that elects to provide assistance to women on the basis of being pregnant (including pregnancy-related assistance provided to targeted low-income pregnant women (as defined in section 2112(d)), pregnancy-related assistance provided to women who are eligible for such assistance through application of section 1902(v)(4)(A)(i) under section 2107(e)(1), or any other assistance under the State child health plan (or a waiver of such plan) which is provided to women on the basis of being pregnant) shall not have in effect, with respect to such women, eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures under such plan (or waiver) that are more restrictive than the eligibility standards, methodologies, or procedures, respectively, under such plan (or waiver) that are in effect on the date of enactment of this paragraph.”

(6) INFORMATION ON BENEFITS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make publicly available on the Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services, information regarding benefits available to pregnant and postpartum women and under the Medicaid program and the Children’s Health Insurance Program, including information on—

(A) benefits that States are required to provide to pregnant and postpartum women under such programs;

(B) optional benefits that States may provide to pregnant and postpartum women under such programs; and

(C) the availability of different kinds of benefits for pregnant and postpartum women, including oral health and mental health benefits, under such programs.

(7) FEDERAL FUNDING FOR COST OF EXTENDED MEDICAID AND CHIP COVERAGE FOR POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—

(A) MEDICAID.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d), as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended—

(i) in subsection (b), by striking “and (aa)” and inserting “(aa), and (ff)”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(ff) INCREASED FMAP FOR EXTENDED MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the Federal medical assistance percentage for a State, with respect to amounts expended by such State for medical assistance for a woman who is eligible for such assistance on the basis of being pregnant or having been pregnant that is provided during the 305-day period that begins on the 60th day after the last day of her pregnancy (including any such assistance provided during the month in which such period ends), shall be equal to—

“(1) 100 percent for the first 20 calendar quarters during which this subsection is in effect; and

“(2) 90 percent for calendar quarters thereafter.”.

(B) CHIP.—Section 2105(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) ENHANCED PAYMENT FOR EXTENDED ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO PREGNANT WOMEN.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), the enhanced FMAP, with respect to payments under subsection (a) for expenditures under the State child health plan (or a waiver of such plan) for assistance provided under the plan (or waiver) to a woman who is eligible for such assistance on the basis of being pregnant (including pregnancy-related assistance provided to a targeted low-income pregnant woman (as defined in section 2112(d)), pregnancy-related assistance provided to a woman who is eligible for such assistance through application of section 1902(v)(4)(A)(i) under section 2107(e)(1), or any other assistance under the plan (or waiver) provided to a woman who is eligible for such assistance on the basis of being pregnant) during the 305-day period that begins on the 60th day after the last day of her pregnancy (including any such assistance provided during the month in which such period ends), shall be equal to—

“(A) 100 percent for the first 20 calendar quarters during which this paragraph is in effect; and

“(B) 90 percent for calendar quarters thereafter.”.

(8) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter that begins on or after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCEPTION FOR STATE LEGISLATION.—In the case of a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act or a State child health plan under title XXI of such Act that the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation in order for the respective plan to meet any requirement imposed by amendments made by this subsection, the respective plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet such an additional requirement before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

(f) REGIONAL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.—Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 399V-7. REGIONAL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE ADDRESSING IMPLICIT BIAS AND CULTURAL COMPETENCY IN PATIENT-PROVIDER INTERACTIONS EDUCATION.”

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with such other agency heads as the Secretary determines appropriate, shall award cooperative agreements for the establishment or support of regional centers of excellence addressing implicit bias and cultural competency in patient-provider interactions education for the purpose of enhancing and improving how health care professionals are educated in implicit bias and delivering culturally competent health care.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a cooperative agreement under subsection (a), an entity shall—

“(1) be a public or other nonprofit entity specified by the Secretary that provides educational and training opportunities for students and health care professionals, which may be a health system, teaching hospital, community health center, medical school, school of public health, dental school, social work school, school of professional psychology, or any other health professional school or program at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965) focused on the prevention, treatment, or recovery of health conditions that contribute to maternal mortality and the prevention of maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity;

“(2) demonstrate community engagement and participation, such as through partnerships with home visiting and case management programs; and

“(3) provide to the Secretary such information, at such time and in such manner, as the Secretary may require.

“(c) DIVERSITY.—In awarding a cooperative agreement under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into account any regional differences among eligible entities and make an effort to ensure geographic diversity among award recipients.

“(d) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make publicly available on the internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services information submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b)(3).

“(2) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate each regional center of excellence established or supported pursuant to subsection (a) and disseminate the findings resulting from each such evaluation to the appropriate public and private entities.

“(3) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall share evaluations and overall findings with State departments of health and other relevant State level offices to inform State and local best practices.

“(e) MATERNAL MORTALITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘maternal mortality’ means death of a woman that occurs during pregnancy or within the one-year period following the end of such pregnancy.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

(g) SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN.—Section 17(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)(3)(A)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking the clause designation and heading and all that follows through “A State” and inserting the following:

“(i) WOMEN.—

“(I) BREASTFEEDING WOMEN.—A State”;

(2) in subclause (I) (as so designated), by striking “1 year” and all that follows through “earlier” and inserting “2 years postpartum”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) POSTPARTUM WOMEN.—A State may elect to certify a postpartum woman for a period of 2 years.”.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MATERNAL MORTALITY.—The term “maternal mortality” means death of a woman that occurs during pregnancy or within the one-year period following the end of such pregnancy.

(2) SEVERE MATERNAL MORBIDITY.—The term “severe maternal morbidity” includes unexpected outcomes of labor and delivery that result in significant short-term or long-term consequences to a woman’s health.

SEC. 4. INCREASING EXCISE TAXES ON CIGARETTES AND ESTABLISHING EXCISE TAX EQUITY AMONG ALL TOBACCO PRODUCT TAX RATES.

(a) TAX PARITY FOR ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO.—Section 5701(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$24.78” and inserting “\$49.56”.

(b) TAX PARITY FOR PIPE TOBACCO.—Section 5701(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$2.8311 cents” and inserting “\$49.56”.

(c) TAX PARITY FOR SMOKELESS TOBACCO.—(1) Section 5701(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$1.51” and inserting “\$26.84”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “50.33 cents” and inserting “\$10.74”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) SMOKELESS TOBACCO SOLD IN DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS.—On discrete single-use units, \$100.66 per thousand.”.

(2) Section 5702(m) of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or chewing tobacco” and inserting “, chewing tobacco, or discrete single-use unit”;

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting “that is not a discrete single-use unit” before the period in each such paragraph; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNIT.—The term ‘discrete single-use unit’ means any product containing tobacco that—

“(A) is not intended to be smoked; and

“(B) is in the form of a lozenge, tablet, pill, pouch, dissolvable strip, or other discrete single-use or single-dose unit.”.

(d) TAX PARITY FOR SMALL CIGARS.—Paragraph (1) of section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$50.33” and inserting “\$100.66”.

(e) TAX PARITY FOR LARGE CIGARS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “52.75 percent” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “\$49.56 per pound and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a pound but not less than 10.066 cents per cigar.”.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary’s delegate, may issue guidance regarding the appropriate method for determining the weight of large cigars for purposes of calculating the applicable tax under section 5701(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) TAX PARITY FOR ROLL-YOUR-OWN TOBACCO AND CERTAIN PROCESSED TOBACCO.—Subsection (o) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, and includes processed tobacco that is removed for delivery or delivered to a person other than a person with a permit provided under section 5713, but does not include removals of processed tobacco for exportation” after “wrappers thereof”.

(g) CLARIFYING TAX RATE FOR OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—Any product not otherwise described under this section that has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration through its authorities under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act shall be taxed at a level of tax equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis as determined by the Secretary.”.

(2) ESTABLISHING PER USE BASIS.—For purposes of section 5701(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, not later than 12 months after the later of the date of the enactment

of this Act or the date that a product has been determined to be a tobacco product by the Food and Drug Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary of the Treasury's delegate) shall issue final regulations establishing the level of tax for such product that is equivalent to the tax rate for cigarettes on an estimated per use basis.

(h) **CLARIFYING DEFINITION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (c) of section 5702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **TOBACCO PRODUCTS.**—The term ‘tobacco products’ means—

“(1) cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, and roll-your-own tobacco, and

“(2) any other product subject to tax pursuant to section 5701(i).”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Subsection (d) of section 5702 of such Code is amended by striking “cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, or roll-your-own tobacco” each place it appears and inserting “tobacco products”.

(i) **INCREASING TAX ON CIGARETTES.**—

(1) **SMALL CIGARETTES.**—Section 5701(b)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “\$50.33” and inserting “\$100.66”.

(2) **LARGE CIGARETTES.**—Section 5701(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “\$105.69” and inserting “\$211.38”.

(j) **TAX RATES ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION.**—Section 5701 of such Code, as amended by subsection (g), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) **INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2018, the dollar amounts provided under this chapter shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2017’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

“(2) **ROUNDING.**—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$0.01, such amount shall be rounded to the next highest multiple of \$0.01.”.

(k) **FLOOR STOCKS TAXES.**—

(1) **IMPOSITION OF TAX.**—On tobacco products manufactured in or imported into the United States which are removed before any tax increase date and held on such date for sale by any person, there is hereby imposed a tax in an amount equal to the excess of—

(A) the tax which would be imposed under section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on the article if the article had been removed on such date, over

(B) the prior tax (if any) imposed under section 5701 of such Code on such article.

(2) **CREDIT AGAINST TAX.**—Each person shall be allowed as a credit against the taxes imposed by paragraph (1) an amount equal to \$500. Such credit shall not exceed the amount of taxes imposed by paragraph (1) on such date for which such person is liable.

(3) **LIABILITY FOR TAX AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.**—

(A) **LIABILITY FOR TAX.**—A person holding tobacco products on any tax increase date to which any tax imposed by paragraph (1) applies shall be liable for such tax.

(B) **METHOD OF PAYMENT.**—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be paid in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulations.

(C) **TIME FOR PAYMENT.**—The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall be paid on or before the date that is 120 days after the effective date of the tax rate increase.

(4) **ARTICLES IN FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.**—Notwithstanding the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the Foreign Trade Zone Act, 48 Stat. 998, 19 U.S.C. 81a et seq.),

or any other provision of law, any article which is located in a foreign trade zone on any tax increase date shall be subject to the tax imposed by paragraph (1) if—

(A) internal revenue taxes have been determined, or customs duties liquidated, with respect to such article before such date pursuant to a request made under the 1st proviso of section 3(a) of such Act, or

(B) such article is held on such date under the supervision of an officer of the United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to the 2d proviso of such section 3(a).

(5) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any term used in this subsection which is also used in section 5702 of such Code shall have the same meaning as such term has in such section.

(B) **TAX INCREASE DATE.**—The term “tax increase date” means the effective date of any increase in any tobacco product excise tax rate pursuant to the amendments made by this section (other than subsection (j) thereof).

(C) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(6) **CONTROLLED GROUPS.**—Rules similar to the rules of section 5061(e)(3) of such Code shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(7) **OTHER LAWS APPLICABLE.**—All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by section 5701 of such Code shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection, apply to the floor stocks taxes imposed by paragraph (1), to the same extent as if such taxes were imposed by such section 5701. The Secretary may treat any person who bore the ultimate burden of the tax imposed by paragraph (1) as the person to whom a credit or refund under such provisions may be allowed or made.

(1) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) through (4), the amendments made by this section shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the last day of the month which includes the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **DISCRETE SINGLE-USE UNITS AND PROCESSED TOBACCO.**—The amendments made by subsections (c)(1)(C), (c)(2), and (f) shall apply to articles removed (as defined in section 5702(j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) after the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **LARGE CIGARS.**—The amendments made by subsection (e) shall apply to articles removed after December 31, 2019.

(4) **OTHER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.**—The amendments made by subsection (g)(1) shall apply to products removed after the last day of the month which includes the date that the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary of the Treasury's delegate) issues final regulations establishing the level of tax for such product.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 122—OBSERVING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GENOCIDE IN RWANDA

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 122

Whereas 25 years ago, between April and June 1994, an estimated 800,000 Rwandans, most of them members of the minority Tutsi community along with some politically moderate Hutus, were killed in an organized campaign of genocide;

Whereas up to 2,000,000 people fled Rwanda as refugees, 1,000,000 were internally displaced, and of the survivors, 75,000 were children who lost one or both parents;

Whereas the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda was dramatically scaled back as the genocide occurred, with the United States and other nations failing to stop the killings;

Whereas the genocide forced Rwandans to confront core issues of ethnic and national identity, justice, peace, reconciliation, and security;

Whereas the people and Government of Rwanda have taken steps to foster peace and reconciliation;

Whereas Rwanda's position on the United Nations Development Program Human Development Index continues to steadily improve, although the nation remains one of the world's poorest, positioned at 158 out of 189 countries and territories requiring continued development assistance and support; and

Whereas the people and Government of the United States support the people of Rwanda in their aspirations for continued economic growth, improved food security, better health outcomes, protection of biodiversity, and fully accountable governance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) solemnly observes the 25th Anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda, which began on April 6, 1994;

(2) recognizes the failure of the international community, including the United States, to provide urgent assistance in preventing and stopping the genocide;

(3) reaffirms that the people of the United States will continue to stand with the people of Rwanda in their ongoing journey towards reconciliation, peace, and open, inclusive, and accountable governance;

(4) reaffirms its commitment to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, done at Paris December 9, 1948;

(5) supports ongoing efforts to educate the people of the United States, and around the world, about the genocide in Rwanda, hoping to prevent the commission of any such future occurrences in Rwanda or elsewhere;

(6) commits to continuing efforts to strengthen and support Rwandan, United States, and other international institutions and tribunals working to bring to justice those responsible for the genocide; and

(7) calls on the United States Government and the international community to seize on the occasion of this anniversary to focus attention on the future of Rwanda, cooperating to prevent and respond to genocide and crimes against humanity in nations across the globe, and to support the people of Rwanda so that they may—

(A) be free from future ethnic violence;

(B) experience full civil and human rights, without fear of violence or intimidation;

(C) peacefully resolve disputes; and

(D) benefit from sustained economic growth and development, which improves the health, prosperity and standard of living of all.

SENATE RESOLUTION 123—SUPPORTING THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND RECOGNIZING ITS 70 YEARS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 123

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded on April 4, 1949, to “safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of [its] peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law”.

(2) The United States Senate approved the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on July 21, 1949, and the United States Government acceded to membership in NATO on August 24, 1949.

(3) NATO is a community of democracies that acts collectively to promote freedom, stability, and peace around the globe.

(4) NATO has continued to welcome into its membership those nations that have evinced a desire to partake in the alliance's commitment to settle international disputes peaceably, strengthen their free institutions, promote conditions of stability and well-being, and seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies, and which are dedicated to maintaining and developing their capacity to resist armed attack.

(5) The sustained commitment of NATO to mutual defense has made possible the democratic and economic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe.

(6) Lasting stability and security in Europe requires the further military, economic, and political integration of emerging democracies into existing European and transatlantic structures.

(7) NATO serves as a force multiplier, whose command structures, training institutions, and multilateral exercises have generated unprecedented multinational contributions to United States national security priorities and enabled European and Canadian soldiers to fight side-by-side with members of the United States Armed Forces.

(8) The allies invoked NATO's Article 5 collective defense clause and offered military assistance to the United States in responding to the attacks of September 11, 2001.

(9) NATO member nations stood in support of the United States after it was attacked on September 11, 2001, sending tens of thousands troops to fight alongside American soldiers in Afghanistan.

(10) NATO is currently involved in several operations benefiting United States national security, including Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan, NATO's Kosovo Force (KFOR), Operation Sea Guardian in the Mediterranean Sea (maritime situational awareness, counter-terrorism at sea, and support to capacity-building), the capacity-building NATO Mission Iraq, support for African Union missions, and air policing missions in the member and nonmember nations of Eastern Europe.

(11) NATO members have stood against Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, have supported United States sanctions on that country and imposed their own, have responded, as noted in the NATO Brussels Summit Declaration of 2018, “to the deteriorated security environment by enhancing our deterrence and defence posture, includ-

ing by a forward presence in the eastern part of the Alliance,” and have asserted that “there can be no return to ‘business as usual’ until there is a clear, constructive change in Russia's actions that demonstrates compliance with international law and its international obligations and responsibilities”.

(12) The NATO Wales Summit Declaration of 2014 pledged, “Allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2% of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defence will aim to continue to do so. . . . Allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defence is below this level will: halt any decline in defence expenditure; aim to increase defence expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the 2% guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO's capability shortfalls.”.

(13) Twenty-two NATO nations have increased their military spending since the Wales Declaration of 2014.

(14) The NATO Brussels Summit Declaration of 2018 stated, “We reaffirm our unwavering commitment to all aspects of the Defence Investment Pledge agreed at the 2014 Wales Summit, and to submit credible national plans on its implementation, including the spending guidelines for 2024, planned capabilities, and contributions. Fair burden sharing underpins the Alliance's cohesion, solidarity, credibility, and ability to fulfil our Article 3 and Article 5 commitments. We welcome the considerable progress made since the Wales Summit with four consecutive years of real growth in non-US defence expenditure. All Allies have started to increase the amount they spend on defence in real terms and some two-thirds of Allies have national plans in place to spend 2% of their Gross Domestic Product on defence by 2024. More than half of Allies are spending more than 20% of their defence expenditures on major equipment, including related research and development, and, according to their national plans, 24 Allies will meet the 20% guideline by 2024. Allies are delivering more of the heavier, high-end capabilities we require and are improving the readiness, deployability, sustainability, and interoperability of their forces.”.

(15) NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg has stated, “By the end of next year, NATO allies will add . . . 100 billion extra U.S. dollars toward defense.”.

(16) Allies who have recently acceded to NATO are amongst the highest per capita contributors to NATO missions.

(17) At the Bucharest Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in April 2008, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of NATO declared, “NATO's ongoing enlargement process has been an historic success in advancing stability and cooperation and bringing us closer to our common goal of a Europe whole and free, united in peace, democracy and common values. NATO's door will remain open to European democracies willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. We reiterate that decisions on enlargement are for NATO itself to make.”.

(18) Vice President Mike Pence in June 2017 reiterated that the United States “commitment [to NATO] is unwavering” and that “NATO's open door must always remain so”.

(19) The Governments, leaders, and parliaments of Greece and the Republic of North Macedonia have ended their dispute and ratified the Prespa Agreement, resolving a long-standing bilateral dispute and establishing a strategic partnership between the two countries and clearing the way for North Macedonia's accession to NATO.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) lauds NATO for its 70-year maintenance of the alliance and recognizes its singular contributions to maintaining the safety, security, and democratic systems of its members;

(2) calls on NATO member states to continue to fully meet their Wales pledges, more fully share the security burden by increasing their defense spending with a focus on meeting capabilities targets, enhancing interoperability, improving readiness, and modernization to respond to the threats that face the alliance on each of its flanks;

(3) stands in robust support of those NATO members who spend two percent or more of their GDPs on defense, acknowledges the four countries that have met that goal since 2014, and strongly encourages the remainder to strive to quickly reach that goal;

(4) affirms that the Senate stands ready to consider, if all applicable criteria are satisfied, the Republic of North Macedonia's application to join NATO;

(5) backs the White House's 2017 affirmation that the United States “stand[s] firmly behind Article 5” of the NATO Treaty;

(6) welcomes former Secretary of Defense James Mattis' efforts to encourage significant NATO reforms, especially regarding modernization, readiness, command structure adaptation, military mobility, and improving NATO's speed of decisionmaking to ensure the alliance remains fit for purpose; and

(7) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to NATO's mission, and its belief that NATO is the most successful security alliance in our Nation's history and one that will continue to be a cornerstone of United States security.

SENATE RESOLUTION 124—CONDEMNING THE MARCH 15, 2019, TERRORIST ATTACKS IN CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND, OFFERING SINCERE CONDOLENCES TO ALL OF THE VICTIMS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND EXPRESSING AND STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 124

Whereas, on March 15, 2019, an armed white supremacist murdered 50 Muslims and injured dozens more at the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand;

Whereas Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern has said that “[i]t is clear that this can now only be described as a terrorist attack,” noting that many of the victims could be migrants or refugees, and pronouncing it “one of New Zealand's darkest days”;

Whereas the people of New Zealand are grieving following the terrorist attacks, which targeted and killed innocent men, women, and children;

Whereas the people of the United States and New Zealand stood shoulder-to-shoulder and shared spilled blood in the struggles of the 20th century to combat fascism, racism, and other extremist ideologies;

Whereas New Zealand is among the closest allies of the United States;

Whereas New Zealand is a diverse nation with a proud tradition of immigration with more than 200 ethnicities and 160 languages, and the strength and vibrancy of New Zealand are enhanced by the diverse religious beliefs and tolerance of its citizens, including followers of all major religions, including Islam, Christianity, and Judaism;

Whereas the suspect in the Christchurch killings is a self-described immigrant-hating white supremacist who used a helmet-mounted camera to broadcast live video of the slaughter in an apparent effort to instigate further white supremacist, anti-Muslim, and anti-immigrant violence;

Whereas, over the past several years, there has been a disturbing increase in white supremacist violence around the globe, with dozens of people of faith murdered, including in their places of worship;

Whereas the scourge of white nationalism around the world must be condemned unequivocally; and

Whereas the reprehensible attacks at the Al Noor and Linwood mosques have no place in a peaceful, civilized, tolerant world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the horrific terrorist attacks on the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the victims of those attacks and their families;

(3) expresses solidarity with the people of New Zealand, including the Islamic community of New Zealand;

(4) recognizes the threat posed by white supremacist terrorism and recommitments United States leadership in building more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant societies; and

(5) calls upon the United States Government to redouble its efforts, using all available and appropriate tools, to combat the spread of white supremacist terrorism.

SENATE RESOLUTION 125—DESIGNATING MARCH 2019 AS “NATIONAL WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH”

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KING, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. MCSALLY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 125

Whereas National Women’s History Month recognizes and spreads awareness of the importance of women in the history of the United States;

Whereas, throughout the history of the United States, whether in the home, their workplace, school, the courts, or in wartime, women have fought for themselves, their families, and all people of the United States;

Whereas, even from the early days of the history of the United States, Abigail Adams urged her husband to “Remember the ladies” when representatives met for the Continental Congress in 1776;

Whereas women were particularly important in the establishment of early charitable, philanthropic, and cultural institutions in the United States;

Whereas women led the efforts to secure suffrage and equal opportunity for women, and also served in the abolitionist movement, the emancipation movement, labor movements, civil rights movements, and other causes to create a more fair and just society for all;

Whereas suffragists wrote, marched, were arrested, and ultimately succeeded in achieving the enactment of—

(1) the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, section 1 of which provides that “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex”; and

(2) the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), which extended the protection of the right to vote to women of color and language minorities;

Whereas, in 2019, the United States celebrates the 100th anniversary of Congress proposing the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees women the constitutional right to vote;

Whereas women have been and continue to be leaders in the forefront of social change efforts, business, science, government, math, art, literature, music, film, athletics, and more;

Whereas women now represent approximately half of the workforce of the United States;

Whereas women once were routinely barred from attending medical schools of the United States, but now are enrolling in medical schools of the United States at higher numbers than men;

Whereas women previously were turned away from law school, but now represent approximately half of law students in the United States;

Whereas women have been vital to the mission of the Armed Forces since the American Revolution, serving in volunteer and enlisted positions, with more than 200,000 active-duty servicewomen and 2,000,000 veterans representing every branch of service;

Whereas more than 10,000,000 women own businesses in the United States;

Whereas Jeannette Rankin of Montana was the first woman elected to the House of Representatives in 1916 and Hattie Wyatt Caraway of Arkansas was the first woman elected to the United States Senate in 1932;

Whereas Margaret Chase Smith of Maine was the first woman to serve in both houses of Congress;

Whereas a record number of women were elected to public office in the 2018 midterm elections;

Whereas, in the 116th Congress, a record 25 women serve as United States Senators, and 102 women serve in the House of Representatives;

Whereas President Jimmy Carter issued the first Presidential Proclamation designating March 2 through 8, 1980, as “National Women’s History Week”;

Whereas, in 1987, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced the first joint resolution to pass Congress designating “Women’s History Month”;

Whereas President Ronald Reagan issued the first “Women’s History Month” Presidential Proclamation in 1987; and

Whereas, despite the advancements of women in the United States, much remains to be done to ensure that women realize their full potential as equal members of society in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2019 as “National Women’s History Month”;

(2) recognizes the celebration of “National Women’s History Month” as a time to reflect

on the many notable contributions that women have made to the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe “National Women’s History Month” with appropriate programs and activities.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Women’s History Month to recognize the tremendous achievements women have made for the United States and pay tribute to their tireless efforts to fight for themselves, their families, and all Americans.

We have set aside this month for over 30 years to give us the opportunity to not only reflect on the past and observe the many accomplishments of American women, but to also inspire the next generation of women leaders. I look upon the great courage our foremothers have displayed with great admiration and continue to personally be inspired by those who blazed the trail for women like me.

When I first came to Washington in 1992, they called it the “Year of the Woman.” Only two other women were serving in the Senate, and four women had just been elected to the chamber, myself included. Today, a quarter of the Senate is represented by women and a record 102 women serve in the House of Representatives, including the first woman speaker. I am proud of the progress we’ve made and hopeful we will continue to build on that momentum toward full equality.

Even at record levels, though, the number of women in Congress falls far short of the 51 percent of our Nation’s population that are women. I have great hope in the next generations of women to rise up and help lead the way in building a better California and United States.

As in government, women have been and continue to be leaders in major social change efforts in our Nation. The business world has been transformed by powerful women at the table, as have science, music, film, athletics, literature, and much more. Today, there are more than 10 million women owned American businesses and half of our workforce is made up of women.

Enrollment numbers at medical and law schools are now almost evenly split between men and women. Our women warriors serve in critical roles in the U.S. Armed Forces, with more than 200,000 active-duty servicewomen proudly serving and a growing number of women veterans representing every branch of service.

Women who have selflessly answered the call to duty have served their Nation with honor, courage, and distinction. I have the utmost respect for the dignity and valor they exhibit and they are commended.

As a United States Senator proudly representing California, I ask you to join me in celebrating the stories and greatness of American women who accomplished the unprecedented and honor their legacies by continuing to defend the rights they worked so hard to achieve. Thank you Mr. President and I yield the floor.

SENATE RESOLUTION 126—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF MARCH 25 THROUGH MARCH 29, 2019, AS “PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK”

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 126

Whereas public education is a significant institution in a 21st-century democracy;

Whereas the public schools in the United States are where students come to be educated about the values and beliefs that hold the people of the United States together as a nation;

Whereas public schools prepare young people of the United States to contribute to the society, economy, and citizenry of the country;

Whereas 90 percent of children in the United States attend public schools;

Whereas local, State, and Federal lawmakers should prioritize support for strengthening the public schools of the United States and empower superintendents, principals, and other school leaders to implement, manage, and lead school districts and schools in partnership with educators, parents, and other local education stakeholders;

Whereas local, State, and Federal lawmakers should support services and programs such as counseling, extracurricular activities, and mental health supports that are critical to help students engage in learning;

Whereas public schools should foster inclusive, safe, and high-quality environments where children can learn to think critically, problem solve, and build relationships;

Whereas public schools should provide an environment in which all students can have the opportunity to succeed beginning in their earliest years, regardless of who they are or where they live;

Whereas Congress should support efforts to advance equal opportunity and excellence in public education and to implement continuous improvement and evidence-based practices;

Whereas every child should receive an education that helps the child reach the child's full potential and to attend schools that offer a high-quality educational experience;

Whereas Federal funding, in addition to local and State funds, supports the access of students to inviting classrooms, well-prepared educators, and services to support healthy students, such as nutrition and after school programs;

Whereas teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals should provide a well-rounded education and strive to create joy in learning;

Whereas superintendents, principals, other school leaders, teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents make public schools vital components of communities and are working hard to improve educational outcomes for children across the country; and

Whereas the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, would be an appropriate period to designate as “Public Schools Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, as “Public Schools Week”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 127—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 127

Whereas, since its inception in 1994, the AmeriCorps national service program has proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,000,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to “get things done for America” by becoming AmeriCorps members;

Whereas, each year, AmeriCorps, in coordination with State service commissions, provides opportunities for approximately 75,000 individuals across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members have served more than 1,500,000,000 hours nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to disasters;

(5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas, since 1994, more than \$9,200,000,000 in AmeriCorps funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members serve at more than 20,000 locations across the United States, including at nonprofit organizations, schools, and faith-based and community organizations;

Whereas AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps campuses in the States of Mississippi, Maryland, Iowa, California, and Colorado strengthen communities and develop future leaders through team-based service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than \$3,700,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members, after their terms of service with AmeriCorps end, have been more likely to remain engaged in their communities as volunteers, teachers, and nonprofit professionals than the average individual;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce and to help close the skills gap in the United States;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111-13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, with people turning toward problems and working together to find community solutions; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2019 from March 10 through March 16, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States;

(2) to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps for making the program possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT TAX-EXEMPT FRATERNAL BENEFIT SOCIETIES HAVE HISTORICALLY PROVIDED AND CONTINUE TO PROVIDE CRITICAL BENEFITS TO THE PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas the fraternal benefit societies of the United States are longstanding mutual aid organizations created more than a century ago to serve the needs of communities and provide for the payment of life, health,

accident, and other benefits to their members;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies represent a successful, modern-day model under which individuals come together with a common purpose to collectively provide charitable and other beneficial activities for society;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies operate under a chapter system, creating a nationwide infrastructure, combined with local energy and knowledge, which positions fraternal benefit societies to most efficiently address unmet needs in communities, many of which the government cannot address;

Whereas the fraternal benefit society model represents one of the largest member-volunteer networks in the United States, with approximately 8,000,000 people of the United States belonging to more than 25,000 local chapters across the country;

Whereas research has shown that the value of the work of fraternal benefit societies to society is more than \$3,800,000,000 per year, accounting for charitable giving, educational programs, and volunteer activities, as well as important social capital that strengthens the fabric, safety, and quality of life in thousands of local communities in the United States;

Whereas, in 1909, Congress recognized the value of fraternal benefit societies and exempted those organizations from taxation, as later codified in section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas fraternal benefit societies have adapted since 1909 to better serve the evolving needs of their members and the public;

Whereas the efforts of fraternal benefit societies to help people of the United States save money and be financially secure relieves pressure on government safety net programs; and

Whereas Congress recognizes that fraternal benefit societies have served their original purpose for more than a century, helping countless individuals, families, and communities through fraternal member activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the fraternal benefit society model is a successful private sector economic and social support system that helps meet needs that would otherwise go unmet;

(2) the provision of payment for life, health, accident, or other benefits to the members of fraternal benefit societies in accordance with section 501(c)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is necessary to support the charitable and fraternal activities of the volunteer chapters within the communities of fraternal benefit societies;

(3) fraternal benefit societies have adapted since 1909 to better serve their members and the public; and

(4) the exemption from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of fraternal benefit societies continues to generate significant returns to the United States, and the work of fraternal benefit societies should continue to be promoted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 203. Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 204. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to

be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 205. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 206. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 207. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 208. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 209. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 210. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 211. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 212. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 203. Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, line 20, insert after “Secretary:” the following: “*Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$150,000,000 shall be allocated to meet unmet infrastructure needs for grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2017 under this heading of division B of Public Law 115-56 and title XI of Public Law 115-123.”.

SA 204. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division A, add the following:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 501. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of assistance provided for DR-4336-PR, DR-4339-PR, DR-4340-USVI and DR-4335-USVI under sections 403, 406 and 407 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emer-

gency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b and 5173) shall be 100 percent of the eligible costs under such sections.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The Federal share provided by subsection (a) shall apply to disaster assistance applied for before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 502. The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall provide assistance, pursuant to section 428 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), for critical services as defined in section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act for the duration of the recovery for incidents DR-4404, DR-4396, and DR-4398 to—

(1) replace or restore the function of a facility or system to industry standards without regard to the pre-disaster condition of the facility or system; and

(2) replace or restore components of the facility or system not damaged by the disaster where necessary to fully effectuate the replacement or restoration of disaster-damaged components to restore the function of the facility or system to industry standards.

SA 205. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after page 55, line 6 through page 62, line 6 and insert the following:

“(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

“For an additional amount for ‘Community Development Fund’, \$1,491,000,000 to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018 (except as otherwise provided under this heading) pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That funds shall be awarded directly to the State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading the Secretary shall allocate an amount necessary to address unmet needs for restoration of infrastructure for grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2017 under this heading of division B of Public Law 115-56 and title XI of subdivision 1 of division B of Public Law 115-123: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided in the previous proviso, the Secretary’s determination of unmet needs for restoration of infrastructure shall not take into account mitigation-specific allocations: *Provided further*, That any funds made available under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254 that remain available, after the funds under such headings have been allocated for necessary expenses for activities authorized under such headings, shall be allocated to grantees receiving awards for disasters that occurred in 2018, for mitigation activities in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018: *Provided further*, That

allocations under the previous proviso shall be made in the same proportion that the amount of funds each grantee received or will receive under this heading for unmet needs related to disasters that occurred in 2018 and the same heading in division I of Public Law 115-254 bears to the amount of all funds provided to all grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2018: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under the text preceding the first proviso under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, the Secretary shall allocate to all such grantees an aggregate amount not less than 33 percent of the sum of such amounts of funds within 120 days after the enactment of this Act based on the best available data, and shall allocate no less than 100 percent of such funds by no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not prohibit the use of funds made available under this heading and the same heading in Public Law 115-254 for non-Federal share as authorized by section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)): *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, grantees may establish grant programs to assist small businesses for working capital purposes to aid in recovery: *Provided further*, That as a condition of making any grant, the Secretary shall certify in advance that such grantee has in place proficient financial controls and procurement processes and has established adequate procedures to prevent any duplication of benefits as defined by section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155), to ensure timely expenditure of funds, to maintain comprehensive websites regarding all disaster recovery activities assisted with these funds, and to detect and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds: *Provided further*, That with respect to any such duplication of benefits, the Secretary shall act in accordance with section 1210 of Public Law 115-254 (132 Stat. 3442) and section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall require grantees to maintain on a public website information containing common reporting criteria established by the Department that permits individuals and entities awaiting assistance and the general public to see how all grant funds are used, including copies of all relevant procurement documents, grantee administrative contracts and details of ongoing procurement processes, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary for approval detailing the proposed use of all funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be used for activities reimbursed by, or for which funds have been made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers, in excess of the authorized amount of the project or its components: *Provided further*, That funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the non-disaster formula allocations made pursuant to section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306): *Provided further*, That a State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe may use up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That the first proviso under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief

Requirements Act, 2018 (division I of Public Law 115-254) is amended by striking ‘State or unit of general local government’ and inserting ‘State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))’: *Provided further*, That the sixth proviso under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (division I of Public Law 115-254) is amended by striking ‘State or subdivision thereof’ and inserting ‘State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))’: *Provided further*, That in administering the funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), if the Secretary finds that good cause exists for the waiver or alternative requirement and such waiver or alternative requirement would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the preceding proviso, recipients of funds provided under this heading that use such funds to supplement Federal assistance provided under section 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 408 (c)(4), or 502 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) may adopt, without review or public comment, any environmental review, approval, or permit performed by a Federal agency, and such adoption shall satisfy the responsibilities of the recipient with respect to such environmental review, approval or permit: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 104(g)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(g)(2)), the Secretary may, upon receipt of a request for release of funds and certification, immediately approve the release of funds for an activity or project assisted under this heading if the recipient has adopted an environmental review, approval or permit under the preceding proviso or the activity or project is categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish via notice in the Federal Register any waiver, or alternative requirement, to any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver or alternative requirement: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building and technical assistance, including assistance on contracting and procurement processes, to support States, units of general local government, or Indian tribes (and their subrecipients) that receive allocations pursuant to this heading, received disaster recovery allocations under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, or may receive similar allocations for disaster recovery in future appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, up to \$2,500,000 shall be transferred, in aggregate, to ‘Department of Housing and Urban Development—Program Office Salaries and Expenses—Community Planning and Development’ for necessary costs, including information technology costs, of administering and

overseeing the obligation and expenditure of amounts under this heading: *Provided further*, That the amount specified in the preceding proviso shall be combined with funds appropriated under the same heading and for the same purpose in Public Law 115-254 and the aggregate of such amounts shall be available for any of the same such purposes specified under this heading or the same heading in Public Law 115-254 without limitation: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”;

(2) at the appropriate place under title X, insert the following:

“SEC. ____ Of all amounts made available for mitigation activities under the heading ‘Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund’ in Public Law 115-123, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations to all eligible grantees, and the necessary administrative requirements applicable to such allocations within 90 days after enactment of this Act;

“(1) For any plans or amendments addressing the use of any funds provided under Public Law 115-123 and received by the Secretary prior to December 22, 2018, the Secretary shall review pending amendments within 15 days of enactment of this Act and pending plans within 30 days of enactment of this Act;

“(2) After the date of this Act, the Secretary may not apply the statutory waiver or alternative requirement authority provided by Public Law 115-123 to extend or otherwise alter existing statutory and regulatory provisions governing the timeline for review of required grantee plans.”;

(3) at the appropriate place under title VI, insert the following new paragraph:

“In addition, for an additional amount for ‘State and Tribal Assistance Grants’, \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$130,500,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and of which \$119,500,000 shall be for capitalization grants under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 604(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(a)(1)(D) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds appropriated herein shall be provided to States or Territories in EPA Regions 2, 4 and 6 in amounts determined by the Administrator for wastewater and drinking water treatment works and facilities impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, such funds allocated from funds appropriated herein shall not be subject to the matching or cost share requirements of sections 602(b)(2), 602(b)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act nor the matching requirements of section 1452(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, each State and Territory shall use the full amount of its capitalization grants allocated from funds appropriated herein to provide additional subsidization to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans or grants or any combination of these: *Provided further*, That, for Regions 4 and 6, notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, for the funds allocated, each State shall use not less than 20 percent but not more than 30 percent amount of its capitalization

grants allocated from funds appropriated herein to provide additional subsidization to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans or grants or any combination of these: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall retain \$37,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein for grants to any state or territory that has not established a water pollution control revolving fund pursuant to title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act for drinking water facilities and waste water treatment plants impacted by Hurricanes Irma and Maria: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated herein shall only be used for eligible projects whose purpose is to reduce flood damage risk and vulnerability or to enhance resiliency to rapid hydrologic change or a natural disaster at treatment works as defined by section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or any eligible facilities under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other eligible tasks at such treatment works or facilities necessary to further such purposes: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, notwithstanding section 603(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(f)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds allocated from funds appropriated herein may be used to make loans or to buy, refinance or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients only where such debt was incurred on or after September 20, 2017: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may retain up to \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein for management and oversight: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”; and

(4) at the appropriate place under title VII, insert the following:

“GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

“SEC. ____ (a) Section 1108(g)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(g)(5)) is amended—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ‘and (E)’ and inserting ‘(E), and (F)’;

“(2) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ‘and (E)’ and inserting ‘and (F)’;

“(3) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F);

“(4) by inserting after subparagraph (D), the following:

“(E) Subject to subparagraph (F), for the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending September 30, 2019, the amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for the Northern Mariana Islands shall be further increased by \$36,000,000.”; and

“(5) in subparagraph (F) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section)—

“(A) by striking ‘title XIX, during’ and inserting ‘title XIX—

“(i) during’;

“(B) by striking ‘and (D)’ and inserting ‘, (D), and (E)’;

“(C) by striking ‘and the Virgin Islands’ each place it appears and inserting ‘, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands’;

“(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘; and’; and

“(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) for the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending September 30, 2019, with respect to payments to Guam and American Samoa from the additional funds provided under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall increase the Federal medical assistance percentage or other rate that would otherwise apply to such payments to 100 percent.”.

“(b) The amounts provided by the amendments made by subsection (a) are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.”.

SA 206. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, line 7, strike “\$1,060,000,000” and insert “\$2,940,000,000”.

SA 207. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 5, strike “\$740,000,000” and insert “\$1,500,000,000”.

SA 208. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, line 11, strike “\$35,000,000” and insert “\$96,000,000”.

SA 209. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 5, strike “\$200,000,000” and insert “\$1,180,000,000”.

SA 210. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 5, strike “\$200,000,000” and insert “\$1,180,000,000”.

On page 19, line 11, strike “\$35,000,000” and insert “\$96,000,000”.

On page 20, line 5, strike “\$740,000,000” and insert “\$1,500,000,000”.

On page 55, line 7, strike “\$1,060,000,000” and insert “\$2,940,000,000”.

SA 211. Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AUTHORITY TO BEGIN PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HAZARD MITIGATION PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(2) the term “covered project” means a project—

(A) that will result in protection to property; and

(B) for which an entity initiated planning or construction before or after requesting assistance for the project under a hazard mitigation grant program; and

(3) the term “hazard mitigation grant program” means—

(A) the predisaster hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133);

(B) the hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c); and

(C) the flood mitigation assistance program authorized under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c).

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE FOR INITIATED PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity seeking hazard mitigation assistance under a hazard mitigation grant program shall be eligible to receive such assistance for a covered project if the entity—

(A) complies with all other eligibility requirements of the hazard mitigation grant program; and

(B) complies with all Federal planning and building requirements for the project.

(2) COSTS INCURRED.—An entity seeking hazard mitigation assistance under a hazard mitigation grant program shall be responsible for any project costs incurred by the entity for a covered project if the covered project is not awarded, or is determined to be ineligible for, assistance.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any application for hazard mitigation assistance for a covered project submitted on or after January 1, 2016.

SA 212. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 201 submitted by Mr. SHELBY and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____01. For all amounts made available for mitigation activities under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in Public Law 115–123, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register the allocations made to all eligible grantees and the necessary administrative requirements applicable to those allocations.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet

during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing "Our blue economy, success and opportunities."

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Chairman's housing reform outline, part II."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Robert A. Destro, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment), to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, and David Stilwell, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Annual oversight of the Smithsonian Institutions."

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting on pending legislation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION, OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Aviation, Operations, Safety, and Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Oversight of commercial aviation."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 27, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 28, the Senate proceed to executive session and consideration of Executive Calendar No. 9; further, that there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—H.R. 297

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 297) to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

HIDDEN FIGURES CONGRESSIONAL
GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 590 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 590) to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 590) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 590

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1935, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (referred to in this section as "NACA") hired 5 women to serve as the first "computer pool" at the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory where those women took on work making calculations that male engineers had made previously.

(2) During the 1940s, NACA began recruiting African-American women to work as computers and initially separated those women from their White counterparts in a group known as the "West Area Computers" where the women were restricted to segregated dining and bathroom facilities.

(3) Katherine Johnson was born on August 26, 1918, in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia.

(4) In 1953, Katherine Johnson began her career in aeronautics as a computer in the segregated West Area Computing unit described in paragraph (2).

(5) As a member of the Flight Research Division, Katherine Johnson analyzed data from flight tests. After NACA was reformulated into the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this section as "NASA"), Katherine Johnson—

(A) calculated the trajectory for Alan Shepard's Freedom 7 mission in 1961, which was the first human spaceflight by an individual from the United States;

(B) co-authored a report that provided the equations for describing orbital spaceflight with a specified landing point, which made her the first woman to be recognized as an author of a report from the Flight Research Division;

(C) was asked to verify the calculations when electronic computers at NASA were used to calculate the orbit for John Glenn's Friendship 7 mission; and

(D) provided calculations for NASA throughout her career, including for the Apollo missions.

(6) Katherine Johnson retired from NASA in 1986.

(7) Dr. Christine Darden was born on September 10, 1942, in Monroe, North Carolina.

(8) In 1962, Dr. Christine Darden graduated from Hampton Institute with a B.S. in Mathematics and a teaching credential.

(9) Dr. Christine Darden attended Virginia State University where she studied aerosol

physics and earned an M.S. in Applied Mathematics.

(10) Dr. Christine Darden began her career in aeronautics in 1967 as a data analyst at NASA's Langley Research Center (referred to in this section as "Langley") before being promoted to aerospace engineer in 1973. Her work in this position resulted in the production of low-boom sonic effects, which revolutionized aerodynamics design.

(11) Dr. Christine Darden completed her education by earning a Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering from George Washington University in 1983.

(12) While working at NASA, Dr. Christine Darden—

(A) was appointed to be the leader of the Sonic Boom Team, which worked on designs to minimize the effects of sonic booms by testing wing and nose designs for supersonic aircraft;

(B) wrote more than 50 articles on aeronautics design; and

(C) became the first African American to be promoted to a position in the Senior Executive Service at Langley.

(13) Dorothy Vaughan was born on September 20, 1910, in Kansas City, Missouri.

(14) Dorothy Vaughan began working for NACA in 1943. Dorothy Vaughan—

(A) started at NACA as a member of the West Area Computing unit;

(B) was promoted to be the head of the West Area Computing unit, becoming NACA's first African-American supervisor, a position that she held for 9 years; and

(C) became an expert programmer in FORTRAN as a member of NASA's Analysis and Computation Division.

(15) Dorothy Vaughan retired from NASA in 1971 and died on November 10, 2008.

(16) Mary Jackson was born on April 9, 1921, in Hampton, Virginia.

(17) Mary Jackson started her career at NACA in 1951, working as a computer as a member of the West Area Computing unit.

(18) After petitioning the city of Hampton to allow her to take graduate-level courses in math and physics at night at the all-White Hampton High School, Mary Jackson was able to complete the required training to become an engineer, making her NASA's first female African-American engineer.

(19) Mary Jackson—

(A) while at NACA and NASA—

(i) worked in the Theoretical Aerodynamics Branch of the Subsonic-Transonic Aerodynamics Division at Langley where she analyzed wind tunnel and aircraft flight data; and

(ii) published a dozen technical papers that focused on the boundary layer of air around airplanes; and

(B) after 21 years working as an engineer at NASA, transitioned to a new job as Langley's Federal Women's Program Manager where she worked to improve the prospects of NASA's female mathematicians, engineers, and scientists.

(20) Mary Jackson retired from NASA in 1985 and died in 2005.

(21) These 4 women, along with the other African-American women in NASA's West Area Computing unit, were integral to the success of the early space program. The stories of these 4 women exemplify the experiences of hundreds of women who worked as computers, mathematicians, and engineers at NACA beginning in the 1930s and the handmade calculations that they made played an integral role in—

(A) aircraft testing during World War II;

(B) supersonic flight research;

(C) sending the Voyager probes to explore the solar system; and

(D) the United States landing the first man on the lunar surface.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of 5 gold medals of appropriate design as follows:

(1) One gold medal to Katherine Johnson in recognition of her service to the United States as a mathematician.

(2) One gold medal to Dr. Christine Darden for her service to the United States as an aeronautical engineer.

(3) In recognition of their service to the United States during the Space Race—

(A) 1 gold medal commemorating the life of Dorothy Vaughan; and

(B) 1 gold medal commemorating the life of Mary Jackson.

(4) One gold medal in recognition of all women who served as computers, mathematicians, and engineers at the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration between the 1930s and the 1970s (referred to in this section as "recognized women").

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

(c) TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MEDALS AFTER PRESENTATION.—

(1) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After the award of the gold medal commemorating the life of Dorothy Vaughan under subsection (a)(3)(A) and the award of the gold medal in recognition of recognized women under subsection (a)(4), those medals shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution where the medals shall be—

(i) available for display, as appropriate; and

(ii) made available for research.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medals received under subparagraph (A) available for—

(i) display, particularly at the National Museum of African American History and Culture; or

(ii) loan, as appropriate, so that the medals may be displayed elsewhere.

(2) TRANSFER TO FAMILY.—After the award of the gold medal in honor of Mary Jackson under subsection (a)(3)(B), the medal shall be given to her granddaughter, Wanda Jackson.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under regulations that the Secretary may promulgate, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medals struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the cost of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

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

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United

States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck under this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 4 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 125, S. Res. 126, and S. Res. 127.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 28; 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, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 268.

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.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING BLAIR OAKS HIGH SCHOOL FOR WINNING THE 2018 MISSOURI CLASS 2 STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Blair Oaks Falcons Football team for winning the 2018 Missouri Class 2 State Football Championship.

With a perfect record of 15–0, the Blair Oaks Falcons Football team and coaching staff should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

Please join me in congratulating the coaching staff: Ted LePage; assistant coaches: Kevin Alewine, Lerone Briggs, John Butler, Mike Cook, Josh Linnenbrink, Mason Swisher, Andrew Terpstra; manager: Ben Stockman; and the players: Kamron Morris, Jayden Purdy, Nolan Hair, Gavin Wekenborg, Seth DeWespire, Cade Stockman, Zach Herigon, Cobi Marble, Carson Prenger, Sam Luebbering, Jake Closser, Ian Nolph, Braydan Pritchett, Riley Lentz, Cadon Garber, Levi Haney, Josh Bischoff, Hayden Ellis, Adam Hughes, Zach Goeller, Trinity Scott, Griffin Herst, Kyler Griep, Adam Jurgensmeyer, Collin Branum, Jordan Keesler, Nico Canale, Conner Wilson, Nolan Atnip, John Benward, Zack Wilbers, Carson Bax, Cale Willson, Caleb Buechter, James Thomson, Austin Lange, Corban Bonnett, Shane Gillmore, Andrew Luebbering, Rylee Niekamp, Benner Thomas, Ayden Chouinard, Isaiah Prenger, Grant Laune, and Marcus Edler on their dedication to the game and focus throughout the season.

I ask you to join me in recognizing the Blair Oaks Falcons Football team for a job well done.

HONORING RUTH WOLFE JOHNSON

HON. GREG PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Ruth Johnson, who recently passed away at the age of 86 in Columbus, Indiana.

Born in Sullivan County, Ruth was the eighth child of Ora and Ann Wolfe. She attended Indiana State University and then went to work at Shell Oil Company. Ruth met—and later married—Dick Johnson, who had purchased a Shell distributorship in Columbus. Ruth and Dick worked together to grow the Johnson Oil Company.

Ruth played an integral role in the Columbus community and throughout the State of In-

diana. Ruth's extraordinary civic leadership included service through many social organizations including PEO, Harrison Lake Garden Club and the Monday literary club. Ruth actively supported Indiana University and served on the advisory boards for the School of Arts and Sciences and Jacobs School of Music.

Ruth and Dick were part of a small group that cofounded Fairlawn Presbyterian Church in 1961. She and Dick donated property for the Salvation Army to build a support center, sponsored the Johnson Center for Entrepreneurship at I.U., the Johnson Distinguished Guest Artist series at the Columbus Philharmonic, and publication of "The Birds of Indiana" by Bill Zimmerman.

The Pence family knew Ruth for many years and considered her a close friend. Ruth was a generous person who will be remembered fondly and greatly missed.

Ruth is survived by her children, Jenny Johnson of Nashville, Rick Johnson (Alice) of Columbus; two grandchildren, Richard "Ricky" Loomis Johnson III and Ann "Annie" Elizabeth Johnson.

May god rest her soul and bring comfort to her family and friends as we mourn her loss and celebrate her life here on earth.

RECOGNIZING MASON DAUGHERTY AND ELI SCOTT

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mason Daugherty and Eli Scott from McKinney, Texas on winning the 2019 C-SPAN video documentary competition.

Their documentary, "What it Means to be American: Citizen Accountability in Government" highlights how the United States Constitution intended to instill power within the American people and how corruption within our system of government diverts that power away from individuals.

Like these impressive 11th graders from Imagine International Academy of North Texas, I too believe power must rest with the people. Working together, we can bring about real change in Washington.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me today in congratulating Mason Daugherty and Eli Scott on their achievement.

CODY MAIER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cody Maier for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cody Maier is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cody Maier is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cody Maier for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF DUI REPORTING ACT OF 2019

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the DUI Reporting Act, a bill I introduced today with my colleague, STEVE CHABOT, along with the support of Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

If enacted, this bill would address the loophole in our nation's drunk-driving laws that enables repeat DUI offenders to be charged and tried as first-time offenders because of inconsistent reporting.

Currently, when police make a drunk driving arrest, they don't always have access to information about all of the driver's previous arrests for driving under the influence.

The reason is because not all police departments report DUI arrests to either the National Crime Information Center, or "NCIC" for short, or the Next Generation Identification database, or "NGI," which are the national crime databases that can be made instantly available to police right from their patrol cars.

The consequences of this lack of reporting can prove tragic. Just a few years ago there was a terrible accident in northern Mississippi, just outside of my Congressional District. Two teenagers from Memphis were killed when the car they were driving was struck by a drunk driver who had accrued seven DUI charges since 2008 and had been allowed to plead guilty five times to a first-offense DUI.

When the law enforcement officer ran the suspect's driving record in the national database, his past DUI convictions never showed up.

This is shameful. A DUI somewhere should be recognized as a DUI anywhere. It should not matter where you were caught driving drunk. If you drive drunk, previous offenses should be recorded and penalties should increase so innocent lives can be saved.

The accrual of multiple first-time DUI offenses is unconscionable and must be ended.

• 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.

Our bill will save lives by enacting common-sense, bipartisan reforms to harmonize reporting standards for DUI offenses across the states.

I urge my colleagues to help pass it quickly.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUPPORTING CHILDREN OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, according to the U.S. Department of Education, more than 80 percent of military-connected children attend public schools. In 2011, the Government Accountability Office reported that data concerning the academic outcomes of these students was limited. In response, Congress passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, which included the military student identifier to require that public schools identify and report on the academic outcomes of military-connected students.

However, the military student identifier only includes children with a parent who is on active-duty in the Armed Forces. Children whose parents serve in the National Guard or Reserve Components are excluded from the military student identifier unless that parent serves full-time. These children still face unique challenges and stressors as members of the National Guard and Reserves often deploy within their respective state in response to state emergencies, directives, or while in training.

Therefore, the Supporting Children of the National Guard and Reserve Act expands the military student identifier to include children of the National Guard and Reserves.

This simple and straightforward change will provide invaluable data for educators, parents, and policymakers to understand the academic outcomes of all military-connected students.

CIERRA MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cierra Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cierra Martinez is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cierra Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cierra Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF CHESTER ELKIN

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a special man, Mr. Chester Elkin, of Madison County, Kentucky. Mr. Elkin is part of a special group of heroes that served our nation during World War II.

Mr. Elkin was born in the small community of Wallacetown in 1919. He served in the Army Air Corps from 1941 to 1946. Mr. Elkin was assigned to an airbase on Ie Jima Island, Okinawa, where he led the development of a runway for landing our aircraft. At the war's end, he was chosen to be in charge of receiving Japanese aircraft and their pilots as they surrendered. Mr. Elkin earned the American Theater Medal, American Defense Medal, Asiatic Pacific Theater Medal with 2 bronze stars, Good Conduct Ribbon, and the Victory Medal for his service in the war.

Mr. Elkin was a civic minded person from a young age and worked to benefit his community. While still in high school, he became the driver of his community's first school bus. At the age of 17, he opened a general store so local citizens would not have to travel to get needed supplies. He later bought property in and around Berea, enabling him to provide numerous new businesses and create jobs. He served on many committees and civic organizations for the Berea community. He was a part owner in Renfro Valley Entertainment, which draws visitors from all over the world. He has been an active member of the Wallacetown Baptist Church since he was a teenager. He has been a member of the American Legion Post 50 in Berea for many years. For 30 years, he served as County Game Warden. Mr. Elkin's involvement over many years resulted in improvements to the quality of life in Berea.

Mr. Elkin and his fellow veterans are true heroes. As members of the "Greatest Generation," they willingly served to protect and defend the freedoms that we enjoy today. I am humbled to honor the service of Mr. Chester Elkin before the United States Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSS SPANO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I was not present for votes on March 5 through 6, 2019 due to an illness. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 104; Yea on Roll Call No. 105; Nay on Roll Call No. 106; and Nay on Roll Call No. 107.

MIGUEL MAY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Miguel May

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Miguel May is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Miguel May is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Miguel May for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2019 H.E.B. ISD AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate thirty-three outstanding students from the Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District who have been awarded the district's Awards of Excellence for the 2018–2019 school year.

The following students have been selected to receive this award due to their meritorious achievements within their respected disciplines. These students possess unique talents and experiences that have enabled their tremendous success within a diverse field of subjects, which include visual and performing arts, business and industry, science, mathematics, and communications, to name just a few.

Jack Alcorn, Troy Curtsinger, Davonia Williams, Jerry Manyvanh, Tristen Strawn, Alina Yoo, Martha Hernandez, Shakyria Bagley, Zachary Campbell, Khusbu Dalal, Jenna French, Alexa Hassell, Lauren Hill, Erin Millican, Mason Ornelas, Beverly Osoro, Nicholas Pena, Isabela Ponce, Coleen Roche, Haley Sawatis, Lauren Adams, Hadee Al Hassanawi, Eric Carlsen, Chloe Crane, Samuel Cusack, Jordan Edwards, Timothy Harris, Dylan Hurt, Nicholas Munoz, Aaron Norgaard, Jake Peters, Allan Stevens, Nelson Tran.

Through their hard work and dedication, these young men and women have built a strong foundation on which to continue their growth and education.

In addition to recognizing the students, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the fine educators who have worked to ensure the needs of these students are met and their talents are nurtured. It is with great pleasure that I recognize the following teachers from Hurst Hills Elementary, Central Junior High, L.D. Bell, Buinger CTE Academy, KEYS, and Trinity High School for their unwavering support of these students:

Lauren Allen, Carolyn Allen, Jo Ann Antinone, Ricky Balthrop, Jennifer Brockman, Tammy Brown, Richard Campanaro, Mario Casanova, Kathleen Chase, Trasa Cobern, Amanda Collins, Kenneth Davis, Christine Davis, Michael Dean,

Blanca Diaz, Logan Douglass, Kendal Fries, Cherie Gibson, Paul Gibson, Candace Harris, Catherine Kazyaka, Sarah Keith, Laurel Kuepker, Van Mathews, Allen Matthews, Karen McCurdy, Joseph Mendenhall, Courtney Miller, Jennifer Muirhead, Ann Nadeau, Louise Payblas, Vandana Rajpurohit, David Rawls.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize these outstanding students and teachers on this monumental achievement. I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating the recipients of the 2019 HEB ISD Awards of Excellence.

JAKE McBRYDE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jake McBryde for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jake McBryde is a student at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jake McBryde is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jake McBryde for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING DUANA BREMER

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, I proudly rise today to honor Duana Bremer, Director of Salvation Army's St. Croix and Polk County Wisconsin programs.

Duana has dedicated her life to serving the most vulnerable among us. I have seen the incredible work she does day in and day out, serving families in our community by showing them the path to personal growth and sustainability. Her commitment and experience makes her an invaluable asset to our work as legislators. Duana testified before the House Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance on May 17, 2018 at a hearing titled, "An Overview of Homelessness in America," in which she provided valuable insight into what the homeless experience is like for those living in rural areas such as Wisconsin.

With the help of Duana, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act and the Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act have been signed into law. Both of these pieces of legislation will help break the multi-generational cycle of poverty in our communities.

It's easy to see the value of Duana's leadership in the fight against homelessness. All you

need to do is talk to her team around her. The staff and volunteers at Grace Place describe her as, "a fantastic leader and a champion for those in need. Her efforts to secure funding and bring programs into rural communities that will help the most vulnerable are truly inspiring. She never gives up and her tireless efforts are an inspiration."

Duana truly is an inspiration. And on behalf of the residents of Wisconsin's 7th Congressional District, I would like to thank Duana Bremer, for her selfless commitment to families in need.

RECOGNIZING THE 100 LADIES OF DEERING

HON. DONNA E. SHALALA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100 Ladies of Deering, a philanthropic women's organization dedicated to preserving the Deering Estate, a pillar of South Florida history. As Women's History Month comes to an end, I am proud to honor the 100 Ladies of Deering for carrying on the long tradition of Miami women working tirelessly on behalf of our community.

Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Deering Estate is the 1920's era Miami home of Charles Deering, an industrialist, preservationist, and environmentalist. The work of the 100 Ladies of Deering is vital to the preservation of the Estate, and more broadly, to keeping our South Florida community connected to our shared history.

The 100 Ladies of Deering are deeply involved in the maintenance of the Deering Estate, including the Stone House, Richmond Cottage, outbuildings, grounds, and natural areas. Today, visitors can explore these sites as they would have appeared when Charles Deering occupied the Estate in the 1920's. The 100 Ladies of Deering provide resources and assistance for the 444-acre Estate's historic furnishings. They preserve original objects in their original settings, recreate the scenes of daily life on the Estate, and create a period setting for original objects. As anyone who has visited can attest, the furnishings evoke a powerful experience of time and space while providing witness to past events and personalities.

The 100 Ladies of Deering exemplify extraordinary dedication to the South Florida community. I am pleased to celebrate their achievements as community leaders, philanthropists, and Miami women.

HONORING THE LOWVILLE AMERICAN LEGION POST 162 ON THEIR CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the American Legion as a whole and specifically, The Lowville American Legion Post 162 on their 100th anniversary.

The American Legion was chartered by Congress in September 1919 after members

of the American Expeditionary Force, who fought in World War I, convened to create an organization to represent veterans of that conflict. Today, the American Legion focuses on serving veterans, current service members children and communities with a membership numbering over two million from 13,000 posts worldwide. The American Legion, under the leadership of its National Commander Brett Reistad, continues to grow and advocate on behalf of those who have served our nation with honor and distinction.

One of the very first posts to come into existence in the months following the creation of the American Legion was the Lowville American Legion Post 162. The National organization came into existence in March 1919 and the Lowville post was founded just three months later, in June. Since then, they have been a leading post, sending members to serve on national, state, and district committees. They have made an indelible impact on the Lowville community over the past century and I wish them continued success. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to congratulate them on this milestone and thank them for their century-long tradition of service.

NOZYONNA McCALL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Nozyonna McCall for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Nozyonna McCall is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Nozyonna McCall is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Nozyonna McCall for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FLORIDA B. THOMAS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mrs. Florida B. Thomas. Florida was a selfless member of her community and spent her life serving others. She was a woman of strong values and always worked to help her community through her church and her jobs as a teacher and librarian.

Florida was born in Tallahassee, Florida in 1938. She attended Florida A&M University where she received her Bachelor of Science

degree in Library Science, before continuing her education at the University of South Florida where she received a Master's in Administration and Supervision.

She served for 59 years at Greater Friendship Missionary Baptist Church, where she was on the finance committee and served as a choir member and secretary. In addition to serving at her church, Florida worked for 40 years as a teacher within the Hendry County School System. After retiring from teaching, Florida felt she could still serve her community so she began working as a full-time librarian at the Harlem Library where she worked until she retired in 2014.

Throughout her career, Florida was recognized again and again for her hard work and dedication to those around her. She was the first black librarian in the state of Florida within the integrated school system and was named "Children Intermediate School (CIS) Teacher of the Year" in 1987. She was also an active member of The Order of the Eastern Star fraternity. In May, 2017 the Harlem Community Library was re-named in her honor, and now serves the community as the Florida B. Thomas Library. And, just last year, she was honored with The Heritage Award for 2018.

Madam Speaker, Florida Thomas was a champion for her community and she positively impacted the lives of many in Harlem and surrounding communities. I extend my deepest condolences to her husband, Melvin, and the rest of her friends and family during this extremely difficult time. Florida Thomas was a blessing to our community and I am proud to honor her memory today. She will be dearly missed.

IN HONOR OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE POLICE ASSOCIATION PIPES AND DRUMS

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the New Hampshire Police Association Pipes and Drums as they celebrate their 25th anniversary. In October of 1994, New Hampshire State Police Sergeant James Noyes was shot and killed during a standoff with an armed barricaded subject. Inspired by the Boston Police Gaelic Column's performance at Sergeant Noyes's funeral, members of the New Hampshire Police Association set out to create a pipes and drums band of their own. Coming together from various police departments across the state, a small group was assembled in December of 1994 and made its official debut in 1996 during the New Hampshire Police memorial in Concord.

Ever since, this distinguished band has grown in size and notoriety. We gather to celebrate a quarter century of this effort, and to acknowledge and honor the life of Sergeant James Noyes and of every New Hampshire law enforcement officer who has been tragically killed in the line of duty.

Sergeant Noyes's sacrifice is a humbling reminder about the acute danger our brave police officers face each day as they put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Their service deserves our appreciation and

our undying support. In order to truly honor their service and sacrifice, we need to do more than pay lip service to their effort. As elected leaders, we have a responsibility to fight for additional resources that allow them to do their jobs effectively for the rest of us.

In order to properly serve New Hampshire's First District and pay appropriate respect to the services we are lucky to receive from our New Hampshire police officers, I am committed to fighting on their behalf in Congress, to guarantee that our law enforcement officials have the resources they need to combat the opioid crisis, keep our streets safe, and protect our communities from harm.

Congratulations to the New Hampshire Police Association Pipes and Drums on 25 years of excellence. It is my honor to serve them as the Representative of New Hampshire's First Congressional District.

KENDALL MCCOY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kendall McCoy for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kendall McCoy is a student at The Manning School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kendall McCoy is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kendall McCoy for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING VICKI HAUGEN'S 37 YEARS AT VERMILION ADVANTAGE

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Vicki Haugen, who took over leadership of Vermilion Advantage 37 years ago.

Vermilion Advantage is the lead economic development office for Vermilion County, Illinois. Vicki began her tenure at Vermilion Advantage during a time when the business environment in Danville and Vermilion County was in turmoil. Major businesses, which had contributed for many years to the financial and economic health of the community, were leaving or considering doing so. Rather than be defeated by these setbacks, Vicki enlisted other community leaders to pull together and develop a coordinated plan to keep the losses to a minimum and attract replacements for those businesses that left.

Vicki saw early on that if the community was to survive and prosper, the political, business, education, and community leaders would need to work together. This became the focus of Vermilion Advantage. More than simply an advocate for the community, Vicki had a comprehensive vision focused on creating the next generation of community leaders and a skilled and educated workforce, diversifying the economic base of the county, and developing a cooperative environment between labor and management, to name just a few of her initiatives.

A major component of what Vicki has done is sell outside companies to the advantages of locating their operations in Vermilion County. Doing this for several decades has likely made Vicki the most informed and effective champion of Vermilion County. Her steady efforts over the past 37 years has had an inestimable impact on the community that she cares so much for.

Indeed, Vicki's efforts are a labor of love. She grew up in Vermilion County, graduated from Danville High School, and lives in the community she helped remake. Her tireless efforts, mental toughness, professionalism, and unshakable faith that Vermilion County was worth trying to save has made a difference worthy of recognition.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure and honor to rise today to recognize Vicki Haugen and to thank her for her leadership of Vermilion Advantage for these past 37 years. That leadership, by the way, has led to the creation of well over four thousand full-time jobs and counting. I wish Vicki all the best and Vermilion Advantage continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KATIE PORTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes on Monday, March 25, 2019. Had I been present, I would have vote YES on Roll Call vote 126.

LEAH MENDOZA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Leah Mendoza for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Leah Mendoza is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Leah Mendoza is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Leah Mendoza for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have

no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BELOVED
CAPITAL REGION EDUCATOR ER-
NEST D. STECK

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of beloved community leader, veteran and educator Ernest D. Steck who passed away in February.

Mr. Steck was a symbol of virtue and discipline to many in our Capital Region. Our community owes him a debt of gratitude for his commitment to educating and shaping the minds of the young men under his tutelage, both in his history classroom and on the football field.

Ernest was born in Rock Island, Illinois and grew up in Chicago and Brooklyn during the Great Depression. He enlisted and served in the U.S. Army during World War II and fought in the Pacific Theater. After the war, he went back to school to earn his undergraduate and advanced degrees in physical education at the University of Iowa.

After brief stints teaching in Bridgeport, Connecticut and Providence, Rhode Island, Ernest moved to Albany and brought his love of teaching to the Albany Academy, where he taught from 1953 to 1991. He also coached football, basketball, track, and tennis. Each discipline provided a welcome opportunity for Ernest to share the principles that guided his life: the importance of hard work, discipline, and integrity. These earned him the respect of his colleagues and students. Classrooms were known to fall silent before he arrived while students waited eagerly for him to speak.

Ernest's legacy of service earned him a promotion to athletic director and a spot in the Capital Region Hall of Fame in August of 2014. If not reminding his teams that "cool heads win games," he could be found virtually silent on the sidelines. He believed in allowing the students to call their own plays, giving them a chance to develop team unity and trust. His creative approaches worked time and time again. In 1970, the Albany Academy football team won the State Championship for small high schools. He led a record-achieving championship streak until 1982. Students he coached referred to themselves as "Ernie's Boys," a moniker that denoted their respect and appreciation. Even to people who never stepped foot on a court or entered an arena, Ernest was legendary.

Above all, Ernest was a proud family man. His legacy lives on in his sons David and Philip and grandchildren Kaylee, James, Alexandra, and Aaron. He was laid to rest in late February alongside his wife Roselyn. To those who knew him, loved him, and were made better by his presence, I offer my sincere condolences.

May we all take inspiration from the incredible service and courage of Ernest Steck and honor his legacy for years to come.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate Women's History Month.

I want to offer a special mention for the U.S. House of Representatives women firsts:

Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin of Montana who was the first elected woman member of the House of Representatives;

Congresswoman Patsy Mink of Hawaii was the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman elected to Congress;

Congresswoman Shirley Anita Chisholm of New York who was the first African-American Congresswoman member of the House of Representatives; and

Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen whom we have the honor of working with is the first Hispanic woman elected to serve in Congress.

National Women's History Month's roots go back to March 8, 1857, when women from New York City factories staged a protest over working conditions.

International Women's Day was first observed in 1909.

In 1981, Congress passed a law authorizing the President to proclaim March 7, 1982 as "Women's History Week." It was a modest beginning, but very significant to women because it started a societal and cultural change in how women—and especially young girls saw themselves within the American story.

In 1987, Congress expanded the week to a month. Every year since, Congress has passed a resolution for Women's History Month, and the President has issued a proclamation.

This month we recognize Women's History Month by noting the fundamental role women have played in shaping America's history. But I say to you that a month is not enough to make known the significant contributions of women to the success of the United States of America.

We taught our girls about Rose the Riveter who represented the millions of American women who went to work on assembly lines to manufacture tanks, planes, and weapons for the defense of this nation during World War II.

We have many American Women heroes in the STEM area like: Sally Kristen Ride, the first woman sent into space; Eileen Marie Collins, the first woman space shuttle pilot; and Grace Murray Hopper an American computer scientist and United States Navy rear admiral.

Admiral Hopper developed the first compiler for a computer programming language, which made it possible to program computers without using punch cards.

The Shriver Report, "A Woman's Nation Pushes Back from the Brink." Some Recommended Steps for Government Businesses, and Women reported on the economic health of the average American woman.

Today, women make up half the U.S. workforce, but the average full time working woman earns only 77 percent of what the average full time working man makes.

And that is why the House must pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, when it comes to the floor for debate and vote.

There are many women in the State of Texas and in the city of Houston who have

made significant contributions to the American story:

Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas was the first African American woman elected to the House of Representatives;

Kathryn "Kathy" Whitmire was the first woman elected to serve in Houston City government; and

Mae Carol Jemison, the first African American woman astronaut.

These many accomplishments does not mean there is not more that needs to be done.

There is still a long way for women to go according to the Shriver Report.

Women are more than 50 percent of the population and more than 50 percent of the votes.

A woman working full time, all year at a minimum-wage job, or a job close to the minimum wage, will not be able to bring her family above the poverty line.

Families need an income closer to 200 percent of the federal poverty threshold to escape the brink.

In the Shriver Report's survey:

73 percent of Americans said that in order to raise the incomes of working women and their families, they strongly favor the government ensuring that women get equal pay for equal work;

79 percent of Americans said the government should expand access to high-quality, affordable childcare for working families;

Almost 60 percent of Americans said women raising children on their own face tremendous challenges and should be helped financially by government, employers, and communities; and

If we are going to win the war on poverty we must wage and win the war of discrimination of women in the workforce.

Pay inequality is not just a women's issue—it is a family income equality issue.

In 2012, Texas' ranked second among the 50 states among with workers earning at or below the federal minimum wage.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics of the 6.1 million workers are paid hourly rates in Texas in 2012,

In Texas 282,000 earned exactly the prevailing federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour, while 170,000 earned less.

From 2011 to 2012, the number of Texas workers who earned at or below the federal minimum wage was 7.5 percent. The percentage of workers earning less than the federal minimum 2012 was 2.8 percent, while the share earning exactly the minimum wage was 4.7 percent.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help celebrate Women's History month by becoming cosponsors of H.R. 863.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF BILLY
MARTIN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Billy Martin, who passed away on Sunday, January 27th at the age of 52.

Billy, a native of Gulfport, Mississippi, graduated from Gulfport High School and attended

Gulf Coast Community College. He went on to be an ice cream delivery driver for Blue Bell Ice Cream for over ten years. It was during this time that he began investing in the lives of young adults at Resurrection Life Worship Center in Picayune, Mississippi. After his time at Blue Bell, he accepted a full-time position at RLM serving as the administrator for over ten years. It was in this role that Bill's heart of service outshined all those around him.

In a world where everyone seems to be dead set on self-promotion and self-advancement, Billy found his joy in serving others. In a world where people are going to extreme lengths to draw attention to themselves, Billy went the extra mile to draw attention to others. In a world where it's common to see people broadcast their own accomplishments, Billy was a megaphone for the achievements and good qualities of others. In a time when everyone wants to see their dreams fulfilled, Billy saw fit to spend his time helping fulfill the dreams of others.

Billy's life is one that should be celebrated and remembered. His legacy of obedience to God and selfless service to others lives on in all the lives he touched.

Left to cherish his memory are his wife and best friend of 17 years, Jameye Hickman Martin of Picayune, his mother, Shirley Martin; his siblings, Randy (Karen) Martin and Terri (Tony) Zbysinski, of the Mississippi Gulf Coast; his brothers-in-law, Rev. Allen (Amy) Hickman of Picayune and Andrew (Karen) Hickman of Brookhaven, 17 nephews and nieces and 9 great-nephews and great-nieces.

HONORING BELOVED ALBANY RESTAURANT LOMBARDO'S

HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bid a fond farewell to Lombardo's, a historic Albany, New York restaurant that was a beloved community staple for nearly a century until its close earlier this year.

Charley Salvatore Lombardo opened what would become this legendary family restaurant in 1919 after making the journey to the United States from Southern Italy. For decades, Lombardo's weathered the changing landscape of the Albany area, generation after generation, never wavering in its service to neighbors and cherished ability to bring people together.

Whether looking for a bite to eat or a brief respite from the demands of daily life, Lombardo's provided a hub of connection and familiarity for the surrounding area. Many Albany residents chose this establishment as the setting to celebrate their milestones, from birthdays to anniversaries to reunions. Artists and authors found inspiration behind its doors. Local entrepreneurs cite Lombardo's as a model that guided their ventures.

Lombardo's memorable Art Deco design and tiled floors saw their last public visitors in December of 2018, but the spirit of the establishment lives on in the stories and memories of its owners, its many servers and staffs, patrons and friends. Thank you to everyone who made Lombardo's such a special place for our community.

THOMAS MILLS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Thomas Mills for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Thomas Mills is a student at Three Creeks K-8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Thomas Mills is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Thomas Mills for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING KAZAKHSTAN ON THEIR PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the historic March 19 announcement by former Kazakhstan President, Mr. Nursultan Nazarbayev, who voluntarily and peacefully resigned from his position as President and as the Head of State.

Kazakhstan's Constitution was prepared for such a scenario and calls for the Chairperson of the Senate of the Parliament to step in and take on the roles and responsibilities for the remainder of the President's term. This transition process, which will usher in the Chairman of the Senate, Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, as Head of State, is moving forward peacefully and with little to no disruption, as all parties involved remain committed to Kazakhstan's further development and prosperity, as well as serving as a stabilizing force in the region. Additionally, I call on President Tokayev to carry out the reforms necessary to hold free and fair elections in 2020, so that the people of Kazakhstan can continue to strengthen their democratic institutions.

For almost 30 years, Kazakhstan and the United States have worked diligently to build a strategic partnership based on mutual trust and cooperation on important issues such as economic investment, security, and cultural exchanges. Both Kazakhstan and the United States have made clear that this strategic partnership and friendship will continue to grow and expand under a new Head of State.

I applaud President Nazarbayev for his work to create a strong and lasting relationship with the United States. In 2018, the U.S. and Kazakhstan signed numerous economic agreements that have paved the way for more than 700 American companies to invest over \$3.7 million in the last year alone. These in-

vestments support jobs and provide an economic boost for both of our economies. In partnership with American companies, Kazakhstan launched the Astana International Financial Center (AIFC) in 2018, which serves as a trading and financing platform for foreign and domestic investors, allowing Kazakhstan to grow as a major financial hub in the region.

Kazakhstan and the United States have also been constructive partners in promoting security and stability around the world. Our two nations work together closely to support peace in Afghanistan and Central Asia through the Strategic Partnership Dialogue, joint-military efforts, and the C5+1 multilateral meetings. Additionally, President Nazarbayev was instrumental in Kazakhstan being the first Central Asian country to be elected to the United Nations National Security Council, providing a voice for the people of the region on a global stage.

The United States welcomes this peaceful transition of power in Kazakhstan as it remains a reliable and trusted partner in Central Asia and I congratulate Mr. Kassym-Jomart Tokayev on his new role.

STEFAN MOE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Stefan Moe for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Stefan Moe is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Stefan Moe is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Stefan Moe for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING ROY BENAVIDEZ

HON. MICHAEL CLOUD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Master Sergeant Roy Benavidez.

My district is proud to claim as one of our own Master Sergeant Roy Benavidez, a Medal of Honor recipient who is among the most distinguished heroes in American history. On the occasion of the Roy P. Benavidez Memorial Highway Dedication, I would like to recognize once more a man who exemplified courage, sacrifice, and unbreakable determination.

Sergeant Benavidez, of El Campo, Texas, was orphaned at a young age and dropped

out of middle school to support his family before answering the call to service in Vietnam. He recovered from a land mine injury to become a Green Beret, and when a call for help came in, he voluntarily boarded a rescue helicopter and put his own life on the line to save his fellow soldiers.

Sergeant Benavidez was shot in the head and the leg but continued working to load the wounded onto the helicopter. As the helicopter took off, the pilot was killed, and the helicopter crashed. Sergeant Benavidez heroically carried his wounded comrades off the helicopter and spent what he described as "six hours in hell" returning fire, calling in airstrikes, caring for the wounded, and even recovering classified documents. He was shot multiple times, bayoneted, clubbed, and hit by fragments from a grenade, before finally dragging the soldiers he came to rescue onto a second evacuation helicopter. He saved the lives of at least eight men.

In 1981, Sergeant Benavidez received the Medal of Honor from President Reagan, who noted that "if the story of his heroism were a movie script, you would not believe it." His Medal of Honor citation declared that his "fearless personal leadership, tenacious devotion to duty, and extremely valorous actions in the face of overwhelming odds were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service."

But his challenges were not over. Two years later, he received notice that his disability benefits were to be cut off, despite shrapnel in his heart and constant pain. So he went before Congress on behalf of his fellow veterans, asking "if they can do this to me, what will they do to all the others?" Thanks to the efforts of Sergeant Benavidez, the President became personally involved in the situation, and the Department of Health and Human Services announced reforms to the review process.

He devoted the rest of his life to service, speaking to students about the importance of education and inspiring American troops around the world.

Sergeant Benavidez was a model of bravery and selfless sacrifice, and it is right and fitting to recognize his heroism by dedicating the Roy P. Benavidez Memorial Highway in his honor. May this highway serve not only as a memorial to a great man but as an inspiration to his fellow Texans to live with the same spirit of courage and service.

JOSEPH MOLINARO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Joseph Molinaro for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Joseph Molinaro is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Joseph Molinaro is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Joseph Molinaro for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

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, March 28, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of General Tod D. Wolters, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States European Command and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and General Stephen J. Townsend, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Africa Command.

SD-G50

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine Alzheimer's, focusing on new directions in biomedical research and caregiving.

SD-106

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the application of environmental, social, and governance principles in investing and the role of asset managers, proxy advisors, and other intermediaries.

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Energy.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold oversight hearings to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing HEA, focusing on addressing campus sexual assault and ensuring student safety and rights.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine arbitration in America.

SD-226

2 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine the proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Commerce.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Ron A. Bloom, of New York, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, and James A. Crowell IV, and Jason Park, both of the District of Columbia, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

3 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the future years defense program.

SR-232A

APRIL 3

9 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Defense Health Program.

SD-192

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD-G50

2:15 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Intellectual Property

To hold hearings to examine women inventors and the future of American innovation.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

SD-138

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-192

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine enhancing tribal self-governance and safety of Indian roads.

SD-628

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration's access to capital programs.

SR-428A

3 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the United States Capitol Police.

SD-124

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine unprecedented migration at the United States southern border.

SD-342

APRIL 9

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

APRIL 10

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine building out Indian country, focusing on tools for community development.

SD-628

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2011–S2062

Measures Introduced: Thirty-five bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 886–920, S.J. Res. 15, S. Res. 122–127, and S. Con. Res. 9.

Pages S2042–44

Measures Passed:

Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 590, to award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S2061–62**

National Women's History Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 125, designating March 2019 as "National Women's History Month". **Page S2062**

Public Schools Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 126, expressing support for the designation of the week of March 25 through March 29, 2019, as "Public Schools Week". **Page S2062**

Contributions of AmeriCorps Members and Alumni: Senate agreed to S. Res. 127, recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States. **Page S2062**

Measures Considered:

Supplemental Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. **Page S2011**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 10:00 a.m., on Thursday, March 28, 2019. **Page S2062**

Nason Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, March 28, 2019, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Nicole R. Nason, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, that there be 15 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, with no intervening action or debate. **Page S2061**

Messages from the House: **Page S2036**

Measures Referred: **Pages S2036–37**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S2037**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S2037**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2037–40**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S2040–42**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2042**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2044–45**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2045–58**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2035–36**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2058–60**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S2060–61**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:33 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 28, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2062.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Army, after receiving testimony from Mark T. Esper, Secretary of the Army, and

General Mark A. Milley, Chief of Staff of the Army, both of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Transportation, after receiving testimony from Elaine Chao, Secretary of Transportation.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Rick Perry, Secretary of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS: LOC AND AOC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Library of Congress and the Architect of the Capitol, after receiving testimony from Carla D. Hayden, Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress; and Christine Merdon, Acting Architect of the Capitol.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from James F. Geurts, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisitions, Vice Admiral William R. Merz, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Warfare Systems, and Lieutenant General David H. Berger, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command and Deputy Commandant for Combat Development and Integration, all of the Department of Defense.

MILITARY SPACE OPERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine military space operations, policy, and programs, after receiving testimony from Kenneth P. Rapuano, Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense and Global Security, Lieutenant General David D. Thompson, USAF, Vice Commander, and Lieutenant General John F.

Thompson, USAF, Commander, Space and Missile Systems Center, both of the Air Force Space Command, all of the Department of Defense; and Cristina T. Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

HOUSING REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Chairman's housing reform outline, part II, including S. 603, to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to consider alternative approaches before determining that a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, after receiving testimony from Michael Bright, Structured Finance Industry Group, Lindsey D. Johnson, U.S. Mortgage Insurers, and Michael D. Calhoun, Center for Responsible Lending, all of Washington, D.C.; Robert D. Broeksmit, Mortgage Bankers Association, Chevy Chase, Maryland; Vince Malta, National Association of Realtors, San Francisco, California; and Carrie Hunt, National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions, Arlington, Virginia.

2020 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Committee began consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020, but did not complete action thereon, recessed subject to the call, and will meet again on Thursday, March 28, 2019.

OUR BLUE ECONOMY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine our blue economy, focusing on successes and opportunities, after receiving testimony from Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant, Jackson; Michael J. Conathan, The Aspen Institute, Washington, D.C.; and Scott Deal, Maverick Boat Group, Fort Pierce, Florida.

THE STATE OF AIRLINE SAFETY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation and Space concluded a hearing to examine the state of airline safety, focusing on Federal oversight of commercial aviation, after receiving testimony from Daniel K. Elwell, Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Robert L. Sumwalt, III, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, and Calvin L. Scovel, III, Inspector General, all of the Department of Transportation.

COLORADO RIVER DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine the Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan, after receiving testimony from Brenda Burman, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; Thomas Buschatzke, Director, Arizona Department of Water Resources, Phoenix; John J. Entsminger, General Manager, Southern Nevada Water Authority, Las Vegas; and Patrick Tyrrell, Wyoming State Engineer, Cheyenne.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Robert A. Destro, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, who was introduced by Senator Cassidy, Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment), to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, who was introduced by Senators Portman and Young, and David Stilwell, of Hawaii,

to be an Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Smithsonian Institution, after receiving testimony from David J. Skorton, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 771, to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors;

S. 772, to require an annual report on the cybersecurity of the Small Business Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 862, to repeal the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans; and

The nomination of David Christian Tryon, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 47 public bills, H.R. 9, 1895–1940; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 27–28; and H. Res. 257–263, were introduced.

Pages H2883–85

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H2887–88

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 1585, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–21, Part 1).

Page H2883

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Costa to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H2831

Recess: The House recessed at 11:14 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H2839

Paycheck Fairness Act: The House passed H.R. 7, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to

provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 134.

Pages H2848–75

Rejected the Foxx motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 133.

Pages H2872–74

Pursuant to the Rule, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–8, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–19, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill.

Page H2860

Agreed to:

Torres amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that recognizes the severity of the gender wage gap for girls and women of color;

Pages H2864–65

Torres amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that highlights the gender pay gap's impact on women and girls of color during research and education efforts conducted by the Secretary of Labor;

Page H2865

Jayapal amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that clarifies that the studies conducted by the Department of Labor concerning the elimination of pay disparities between men and women must include information about, and an analysis of, women of all racial and ethnic backgrounds;

Pages H2867–68

Lawrence amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that requires the Department of Labor to conduct a study on the gender pay gap in the teenage workforce and provide recommendations for how to address the gap;

Pages H2870–71

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that makes it unlawful to discriminate against an employee for inquiring or discussing with the employer why the wages of the employee are set at a certain rate or salary; and

Pages H2871–72

Beyer amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that exempts employers with fewer than 100 employees from reporting compensation data under Section 8 of this Act (by a recorded vote of 406 yeas to 24 nays, Roll No. 132).

Pages H2868–70, H2872

Rejected:

Foxx amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that sought to strike Section 8 relating to the collection by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission of pay information and other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) disaggregated by the sex, race, and national origin of employees; and

Pages H2863–64

Byrne amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–19) that sought to clarify that the “any other factor other than sex” defense in the Equal Pay Act means “a bona fide business-related reason other than sex”; strike Section 3(a)(B) relating to the application of the factor other than sex defense to an Equal Pay Act claim.

Pages H2865–67

H. Res. 252, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) and the resolution (H. Res. 124) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nays vote of 232 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 131, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 231 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 130.

Pages H2840–47

Providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and agree to H. Res. 245, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress.

Pages H2875–76

Providing for a recess of the House for a joint meeting to receive His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Agreed by unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Page H2876

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, March 28th.

Page H2876

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yeas-and-nays votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2846–47, H2847, H2872, H2874, and H2874–75. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:34 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the Department of State. Testimony was heard from Mike Pompeo, Secretary, Department of State.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. Testimony was heard from Brenda Burman, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; R.D. James, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Tim Petty, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of Interior; and Lieutenant General Todd T. Semonite, Chief of Engineers and Commanding General, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Finkenauer and Jackson Lee.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Fitzpatrick, Haaland, Jackson Lee, Khanna, McCollum, Smith of New Jersey, Suozzi, Hagedorn, Visclosky, and Wild.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Testimony was heard from Neil Jacobs, Acting Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

USDA’S PROPOSED RELOCATION OF THE ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE AND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “USDA’s Proposed Relocation of the Economic Research Service and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture”. Testimony was heard from Kristi J. Boswell, Senior Advisor to the Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY, U.S. CYBER COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the National Security Agency, U.S. Cyber Command. Testimony was heard from General Paul M. Nakasone, Director, Commander, National Security Agency, Cyber Command. This hearing was closed.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Visclosky, Posey, Gallagher, Comer, and Haaland.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related

Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Veterans Affairs officials: Paul R. Lawrence, Under Secretary for Benefits; Jon Rychalski, Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer; Richard A. Stone, M.D., Executive in Charge, Veterans Health Administration; and Robert Wilkie, Secretary.

PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Hearing”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Testimony was heard from James Bridenstine, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the National Reconnaissance Office. Testimony was heard from Frank Calvelli, Principal Deputy Director, National Reconnaissance Office. This hearing was closed.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN THE INDO-PACIFIC

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in the Indo-Pacific”. Testimony was heard from Admiral Philip S. Davidson, U.S. Navy, Commander, U.S. Indo-Pacific Command; General Robert B. Abrams, U.S. Army, Commander, United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, and U.S. Forces Korea; and Randall G. Schriver, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Indo-Pacific Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

RESERVE COMPONENT DUTY STATUS REFORM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “Reserve Component Duty Status Reform”. Testimony was heard from Jeri Bucsh, Director, Military Compensation Policy, Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense; Major General Michael R. Taheri, U.S. Air Force, Director, Joint Staff, National Guard Bureau; Major

General A.C. Roper, U.S. Army, Deputy Chief, Army Reserve; Patrick J. Barrett, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief, Navy Reserve; Lieutenant General Richard W. Scobee, U.S. Air Force; Chief, Air Force Reserve; and Major General Bradley S. James, U.S. Marine Corps, Commander, Marine Forces Reserve.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Department of Defense's Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request". Testimony was heard from David L. Norquist, Performing the Duties of Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense.

INNOVATIONS IN EXPANDING REGISTERED APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment held a hearing entitled "Innovations in Expanding Registered Apprenticeship Programs". Testimony was heard from public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 1781, the "Payment Commission Data Act of 2019"; H.R. 938, the "BLOCKING Act of 2019"; H.R. 1520, the "Purple Book Continuity Act of 2019"; H.R. 1503, the "Orange Book Transparency Act of 2019"; H.R. 1499, the "Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act of 2019"; H.R. 965, the "CREATES Act of 2019"; H.R. 1385, the "SAVE Act"; H.R. 1386, the "ENROLL Act of 2019"; H.R. 1425, the "State Health Care Premium Reduction Act"; H.R. 987, the "MORE Health Education Act"; H.R. 986, the "Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019"; and H.R. 1010, a bill to provide that the rule entitled "Short-Term, Limited Duration Insurance" shall have no force or effect. H.R. 1781, H.R. 938, H.R. 1385, H.R. 1386, H.R. 987, H.R. 986, and H.R. 1010 were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment. H.R. 1520, H.R. 1503, H.R. 965, H.R. 1499, and H.R. 1425 were forwarded to the full committee, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee continued a markup on H.R. 389, the "Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Rewards Act"; H.R. 1500, the "Consumers First Act"; H.R. 1595, the "Secure and Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2019"; H.R. 1815, the "SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act"; and H.R. 1856, the "Ending Homelessness Act of 2019".

MAKING SANCTIONS EFFECTIVE: THE CASE OF NORTH KOREA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation held a hearing entitled "Making Sanctions Effective: The Case of North Korea". Testimony was heard from a public witness.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY AND FY20 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "The State Department's Foreign Policy Strategy and FY20 Budget Request". Testimony was heard from Michael R. Pompeo, Secretary, Department of State.

LOST EINSTEINS: LACK OF DIVERSITY IN PATENT INVENTORSHIP AND THE IMPACT ON AMERICA'S INNOVATION ECONOMY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled "Lost Einsteins: Lack of Diversity in Patent Inventorship and the Impact on America's Innovation Economy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE OF THE PARDON POWER

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled "Examining the Constitutional Role of the Pardon Power". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S SPENDING PRIORITIES AND THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET PROPOSAL

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Examining the Department of the Interior's Spending Priorities and the President's Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal". Testimony was heard from Scott Cameron, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget, Department of the Interior; and Denise Flanagan, Director, Office of Budget, Department of the Interior.

EPA'S IRIS PROGRAM: REVIEWING ITS PROGRESS AND ROADBLOCKS AHEAD

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight; and Subcommittee on Environment held a joint hearing entitled "EPA's IRIS Program: Reviewing its Progress and Roadblocks Ahead". Testimony was heard from Jennifer Orme-Zavaleta, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science and Science

Advisor, Office of Research and Development, Environmental Protection Agency; Alfredo Gomez, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a markup on H.R. 34, the “Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019”. H.R. 34 was forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

UNLOCKING SMALL BUSINESS RETIREMENT SECURITY

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Unlocking Small Business Retirement Security”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1108, the “Aviation Funding Stability Act of 2019”; H.R. 1775, to establish a task force on NOTAM improvements, and for other purposes; H.R. 367, the “Pay Our Coast Guard Parity Act of 2019”; H.R. 1322, to require a report on the effects of Climate Change on the Coast Guard; H.R. 1306, the “Federal Disaster Assistance Coordination Act”; H.R. 1307, the “Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act”; H.R. 1311, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to ensure that unmet needs after a major disaster are met; and H.R. 1331, the “Local Water Protection Act”. H.R. 1331, H.R. 1311, H.R. 1307, H.R. 1306, H.R. 1322, and H.R. 1775 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 367 and H.R. 1108 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE 2017 TAX LAW AND WHO IT LEFT BEHIND

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The 2017 Tax Law and Who It Left Behind”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS OF THE PAST AND THEIR EFFECT ON TODAY’S CONGRESS

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Congressional Reforms of the Past and Their Effect on Today’s Congress”. Testimony was heard from Walter Oleszek, Senior Specialist, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Coast Guard, 10 a.m., SD-192.

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Education, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Food and Drug Administration, 10:30 a.m., SD-138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine Department of Energy’s atomic energy defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to markup the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020, 10:30 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the Federal response to the risks associated with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Daniel P. Collins, and Kenneth Kiyul Lee, both of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, James Wesley Hendrix, and Mark T. Pittman, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Sean D. Jordan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Wing Chau, to be United States Marshal for the District of Rhode Island, and Ramona L. Dohman, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota, 10 a.m., SD-226.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the U.S. Forest Service, 10 a.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs:

Maintaining a Robust Ecosystem for our Technological Edge”, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled “FY20 Priorities for Department of Defense Nuclear Activities”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, continue markup on H.R. 389, the “Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Rewards Act”; H.R. 1500, the “Consumers First Act”; H.R. 1595, the “Secure and Fair Enforcement Banking Act of 2019”; H.R. 1815, the “SEC Disclosure Effectiveness Testing Act”; and H.R. 1856, the “Ending Homelessness Act of 2019”, 8:45 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, hearing entitled “The Colorado

River Drought Contingency Plan”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled “Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation: Innovative Approaches and Economic Development Opportunities”, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Putin’s Playbook: The Kremlin’s Use of Oligarchs, Money and Intelligence in 2016 and Beyond”, 9 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, March 28

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 268, Supplemental Appropriations Act, post-cloture.

At 1:30 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Nicole R. Nason, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H. Res. 124—Expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E358
 Chabot, Steve, Ohio, E362
 Cloud, Michael, Tex., E362
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E357
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E358
 Duffy, Sean P., Wisc., E359
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E359

Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E361
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E361
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E357
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E358
 Pappas, Chris, N.H., E360
 Pence, Greg, Ind., E357
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E357, E358, E358, E359, E359,
 E360, E360, E362, E362, E363
 Porter, Katie, Calif., E360

Shalala, Donna E., Fla., E359
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E360
 Spano, Ross, Fla., E358
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E359
 Taylor, Van, Tex., E357
 Tonko, Paul, N.Y., E361, E362



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