



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2019

No. 86

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 22, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK DESAULNIER 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.

### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF GARY LEE MITCHELL

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Gary Lee Mitchell, who passed away on March 13, 2019.

Gary was born in Jacksonville, Illinois, and was the son of the late Eldred Dale Mitchell and the late Mary Green McGath. Gary served in the United States Navy from 1965 to 1972 aboard

the USS *Nathaniel Green* submarine as a nuclear reactor operator.

Gary worked with Duke Energy for 43 years, where he was known as the resident expert in the field of nuclear energy and oversaw mentoring new interns coming into the field. Gary was awarded the prestigious J.B. Duke Award, which recognized his career knowledge of how to react to critical situations in saving a coworker from serious injury or death.

Gary lived a life of service to others and voluntarily joined many organizations, including the American Legion in 1972, where he served as district commander at the South Carolina Department American Legion. He served as zone commander and all vice commander levels. On June 2, at the 94th annual convention held in Greenville, South Carolina, Gary was elected department commander of the South Carolina American Legion Department.

Gary was married to Marlene A. Mitchell for over 50 years and had two daughters, Stephanie and Stacy, and his grandchildren, Victoria, Alexandria, and Mitchell Friel. In describing what type of husband Gary Mitchell was to his wife, Marlene, she stated that "he was her best friend and was the kindest person she ever knew."

The world is a better and kinder place because of the life of Gary Lee Mitchell, and he was a man who served his God, his family, and his country.

### NOW IS THE TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, a proud American, and I rise because I love my country.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here today, I would call to the attention of those who are within the view of what we are doing the fact that we are now some 35

days since the Mueller report has been made public. It was released before that, but it has been made public some 35 days.

This means that, for 35 days now, this administration has been above the law if we allow the genesis of the start to be the date that the report was issued to the public, made public.

The Mueller report is clear: The President was not exonerated when it comes to obstruction of justice. The Mueller report, in essence, has given this Congress the opportunity to fulfill its constitutional responsibility. That responsibility is to take up the cause of justice.

The Framers of the Constitution intended for the Congress of the United States of America to be the place where the balance of power is maintained. We are the check on the President, such that we can maintain the balance of power. It was never intended that there be a concentration of power within the executive branch to the extent that it is being concentrated by virtue of the actions of this President.

Allow me to explain.

This President has refused to honor subpoenas.

He has encouraged witnesses not to appear.

He has encouraged persons to avoid the responsibility that they have as holders of public trust, the Secretary of the Treasury to produce documents.

He is engaging and is encouraging others to engage in a coverup. This is a coverup. We, the Members of this august body, have a duty and a responsibility not to allow this coverup to continue.

When we took our oath of office, we said, by and through that oath, that we would defend this Constitution. Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution accords us the power to check the President so as to maintain the balance of power. When we refuse to do so or if we decline to do so or if we just don't, for

□ 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.

H4069

whatever reasons, do so, we are not living up to our responsibilities.

Article II, Section 4 deals with impeachment. It is time for this Congress to start the impeachment process. I have been very adamant about this. I stand where I have stood now for more than 2 years. I have been said to be the voice of impeachment in the Congress. I am not the voice. The Members of this body will be the voice of impeachment when and if we take it up, and I assure you we will. If nobody else does, I will.

But the point is, this is our moment. This is what we have been mandated to do, to bring impeachment before the House of Representatives, especially given that we said we would wait until the Mueller report was finished, and then we would act.

Well, time has lapsed, and this is the time for us to act. We are the Members who can make the difference. This is the Congress of the United States of America.

Let me add this. I know these are difficult times for a good many persons and there are those who question whether we should do this given what the Senate may do. Well, we do a lot of things knowing that the Senate will not act as we would have them act. We send bills to the Senate quite routinely knowing that the Senate will reject these bills.

But it is our responsibility to act, and we then allow the Senate to do its job. If the Senate chooses not to, that is on the Senate. The House will have performed its responsibility.

So let us not be guided by political expediency, the question of whether the Senate is going to act. Let us stand on the moral imperative that we have to act.

Some have said that the soul of the country is at risk. Well, the truth is this, before the soul of the country is lost, the soul of the House of Representatives will be lost if we do not act on this moral imperative.

This is what we must do to maintain the House of Representatives' integrity and its prowess as a coequal branch of the government, which some say has a little bit more authority than the executive by virtue of its having a check on the executive.

Mr. Speaker, each day that I come, I will show the amount of time that has lapsed during which this administration is engaged in a coverup and is above the law.

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

#### RECOGNIZING THE NEW HOPE- SOLEBURY MIDDLE SCHOOL RO- BOTICS CLUB

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding

group of citizens in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who are actively engaged in academic achievement.

Last year, New Hope-Solebury Middle School established its robotics club, and it did not take long for that club to grow and find success. They quickly grew to 20 students strong, with 5 students recently awarded the Judges Award at the competitive VEX Robotics Competition.

The robotics club at New Hope-Solebury Middle School is looking to build off of its accomplishments. With the help of librarian Craig Smith and school board member Mark Cowell, members are looking to become more active in competitions to demonstrate their skills. Recently, the Lambertville-New Hope Rotary Club, of which Mark is a member, held a fundraiser to assist these kids in reaching their goals.

I would like to congratulate members of the New Hope-Solebury Middle School robotics club on their achievements. I would like to thank Mark and Craig and members of the Lambertville-New Hope Rotary Club for their vision.

#### RECOGNIZING WALTER WYDRO FOR HIS STEAD- FAST COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY SERVICE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a citizen of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for his steadfast commitment to community service.

Walter Wydro, a resident of Upper Makefield, has been a constant presence in local initiatives for 50 years. Walter has been a champion for land preservation and played a significant role in open space efforts in Upper Makefield Township.

Since 1972, Walter has served on the Upper Makefield Planning Commission. He was also a founding member of the Newtown Area Zoning Jointure, the first of its kind in the State of Pennsylvania.

In 2004, Walter was named Upper Makefield's Volunteer of the Year and, in 2005, he joined the Bucks County Planning Commission. His work has been so impactful and his reach and expertise so great that the Bucks County Commissioners declared May 7, 2019, Walter Wydro Day.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the privilege to represent such a thoughtful and compassionate constituent as Walter, and I thank Walter for his innumerable contributions to our community.

#### RECOGNIZING BEN HARDER FOR HIS STRENGTH AND PERSEVERANCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding resident from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who is teaching us all about strength and perseverance.

Ben Harder, a resident of Levittown, recently participated in the Kiwanis-Herald Sesame Place Classic, which I was honored to attend. This was Ben's 21st consecutive year participating in the 5K race, an event cherished by our local community. His presence this

year was made remarkable, however, due to the fact that Ben is currently undergoing chemotherapy for pancreatic cancer.

Mr. Speaker, Ben is no stranger to athletic feats. While a student at The University of Southern Mississippi, he was also a top-ranked power lifter for his weight class.

I would like to honor Ben for his strength and his spirit in the face of adversity, and our entire community is praying for him as he undergoes treatment.

I would also like to extend our best wishes to Ben's family, including his siblings, Arthur, Chloe Belle, Rosen, and Eleanor.

#### RECOGNIZING THE COLOMBIA MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. PRO- GRAM

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Martin Luther King, Jr. program in Colombia and to recognize the tremendous leadership of my friend and colleague from New York, Congressman GREG MEEKS.

The Martin Luther King, Jr. program is a modest project funded by the United States Agency for International Development. It provides scholarships to outstanding Afro-Colombian and indigenous students to learn English as a second language and receive leadership training. The program began in 2006 and has supported over 370 students.

While leading a bipartisan delegation to Colombia in April, Congressman MEEKS and I, along with five of our colleagues, had the opportunity to meet with young people participating in the program and hear firsthand the impacts this program has had on their community.

The students told us how their experience with the MLK program went far beyond just learning English. They have developed important leadership skills, which they have used to launch successful community improvement projects and to become role models in their neighborhoods.

They told us how the program fosters an environment in which the students learn from one another about how to make a positive difference in the lives of others.

I want to recognize my good friend and colleague, Congressman MEEKS, who led the effort to establish this program back in 2006. While in Colombia last month, Mr. MEEKS spoke passionately to the students about how they are the future of Colombia. Thanks in no small part to Mr. MEEKS' efforts, that future now looks very bright.

Congressman MEEKS' leadership has been essential, not only to the success of this program, but to supporting Colombia's democratic progress over the last two decades and strengthening the U.S.-Colombia partnership. His tireless dedication to the underserved communities has been critical, and I am proud to serve alongside him.

□ 1015

While there is still a great deal of work to be done, Congressman MEEKS has helped the Colombian Government establish a society based on the rule of law.

He has worked to ensure that the voices of Afro-Colombians and other historically marginalized populations are heard. He has helped inspire a new and more diverse generation of leadership.

I look forward to seeing the continued impact of this tremendous effort. I am hopeful that these Martin Luther King, Jr., scholars will become leaders not only in their communities but of their country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MEEKS for his hard work, his passion, and his dedication to educating, inspiring, and supporting leaders of tomorrow.

#### TAKE ACTION TO RESTORE FLORIDA'S WATER QUALITY

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

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, when Members think of my home State of Florida, they think of water. From our beaches to our springs to our lakes and our rivers, Florida's waterways stretch far and wide, covering nearly 26,000 miles.

Florida's Sixth District, my district, is no exception, with miles of Atlantic Coast to the east and bordered by the St. Johns River to the west.

From the Matanzas River marsh to the Everglades, water is at the heart of Florida's ecosystem and its natural beauty. People are drawn to Florida's water, and the numbers prove it. One thousand people per day move to the Sunshine State, with a record 126 million people visiting Florida last year.

Tourism drives our economy, and Florida's tourism is dependent on clean water and its natural resources.

Unfortunately, our water quality is threatened right now. We saw a new blue-green algae bloom erupt in the St. Johns River just last month. While it is too early to know exactly the specific cause of this incident, we do know what causes algae blooms, and there are steps the government can and should take to prevent them.

This is why I am focusing my efforts to remove septic tanks from my district and connecting those communities to new sewer utilities.

I am grateful for our State lawmakers and Governor Ron DeSantis, who prioritized water quality this year, putting \$49 million toward water quality and wastewater grants and \$25 million specifically for septic-to-sewer conversions. These conversions will have a positive impact by lessening discharges since septic leakage contributes to these growing algae blooms and these growing algae problems.

We must leverage these State resources with Federal funds to address

the full needs of Florida. We have the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program and State Clean Water Revolving Fund program, but they need to be better focused and better utilized to address this issue.

We have to do more. That is why I requested much-needed funding for our National Estuary Program, which funds the Indian River Lagoon, in the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill. The Indian River Lagoon in my district has, unfortunately, fallen victim to septic leakage and requires a plan for restoring water quality.

The National Estuary Program supports and will help maintain healthy water and estuary ecosystems like the Indian River Lagoon.

Alongside many of my Florida delegation colleagues, I supported the \$200 million funding request for the Everglades restoration project in April, and I am glad President Trump has amended his budget to include the Everglades. Everglades restoration is dependent on cleaning Lake Okeechobee and its discharges, which impact water along our coast.

I also commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for passing the Energy and Water bill yesterday, which includes that \$200 million figure. These requests will go directly toward improving Florida's waterways across the State and areas like the Indian River Lagoon, if signed into law.

I am hopeful that, here in Congress, we can get this legislation passed through the House, passed through the Senate, and onto the President's desk for signature. It is the right thing to do for communities along the St. Johns River and necessary for maintaining the travel and tourism that drives Florida's economy.

We must restore Florida's water quality and take this issue very seriously.

#### RECOGNIZING CHANCELLOR LELAND

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true pioneer in education at the University of California at Merced, the newest campus not only in California but among the newest in the country.

Dorothy Leland, our chancellor, is retiring, but she has paved the way for this newest university.

Chancellor Leland and her staff have built a community at UC Merced that is very special. More than 44 percent of the faculty are women. Over the past 5 years, the number of graduate students attending the university has increased by nearly 75 percent.

Probably most impressive of all, I think, is that nearly 75 percent of the students are the first in their families to attend university, and a majority of these are minorities. It is a majority-minority campus.

As a child of Mexican immigrants herself and the first in her family to graduate from college, Chancellor Leland feels a real connection to the student body. She is outspoken about DACA students, with almost 600 DACA students in the university today. She even traveled here to our Nation's Capitol to fight on behalf of Dreamers.

She is one of the founding members of the Presidents' Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration, a group of more than 200 leaders who support policies that help immigrant, undocumented, and international students succeed at U.S. universities and colleges.

In her retirement, she said she wants to work on immigration reform. We can use that help.

But her work for the students and the campus at UC Merced does not end there. Arriving in 2011 during the Great Recession, Chancellor Leland immediately went to work on developing the university, because of the importance of this campus to the San Joaquin Valley, with a major construction project. She fought for \$1.3 billion in funding to help expand the university, including the construction of new dorm rooms, research labs, a conference center, and an athletic facility. That project has allowed the university to expand from 5,000 to over 8,000 students and doubled the size of the campus.

She has also succeeded in graduation rates, which are up by 12 percent during her tenure. I am proud to say that, last weekend, over 1,300 students graduated.

UC Merced has achieved impressive levels of academic and research distinction and is developing numerous new patents and leading cutting-edge research.

I would also like to take this opportunity to give another shout-out, and that is to President Joe Castro and the faculty and the student body at Fresno State, home of the Bulldogs.

This past weekend, Fresno State graduated over 6,000 students, the largest in the school's history. Over 25,000 students are enrolled at Fresno State, ranked by Washington Monthly last year as one of the top 25 campuses in the United States.

Most importantly, more than 60 percent of the graduating students are the first in their generation to attend and graduate from university.

Both these universities are serving our Nation and doing what, in fact, they should be doing, which is educating and training our Nation's next generation of leaders who will make a difference and who will make America a better place.

I am honored to represent such successful universities in my district, and I am proud of both these leaders, the faculties, and the student bodies because they represent the future of America.

Go Bobcats, and go Bulldogs.

RECONSIDER FUNDING LEVELS FOR FEMA AND CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, let me note that the President's action this week

as it relates to funding for FEMA and California's wildfires, as well as the funding for the United States Department of Agriculture in terms of where those moneys go for forestry, is wrong. It is wrong; it is punitive; and it is painful.

For the fires in California, 60 percent are on U.S. forestry land. Therefore, to be responsible, the United States needs to do its part when these horrific fires take place.

We do the same with hurricanes. We do the same with tornadoes. We do the same with floods. So it seems to me that the President ought to reconsider his actions toward California.

We are partners in trying to manage both State and Federal lands not only in California but around the country. Therefore, the President's actions should be reconsidered.

It should not be punitive toward California because, through no fault of our own, we have had to deal with these horrific circumstances, just like other regions of the country have to deal with natural disasters that are through no fault of their own.

Let's reconsider, Mr. President. Let's not be punitive toward California because of the tremendous devastation that these fires have created.

#### REMEMBERING THE FALLEN THIS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this weekend marks one of our most solemn occasions, Memorial Day, where we mourn those we have lost in the defense of this Nation.

Many in this House will attend ceremonies throughout the weekend and on Memorial Day, which is observed annually on the last Monday of May.

The traditional Memorial Day dates back to 1864 in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania, my home county, where three ladies decorated the graves of fallen Civil War soldiers. The custom has continued every year since then. Boalsburg still puts on a traditional Memorial Day celebration, complete with a parade, a community walk to the cemetery, speeches, military reenactments, and much more.

We must never forget the unthinkable pain for the families whose loved ones have not returned home, and this includes those missing in action and prisoners of war. Currently, there are more than 83,000 American servicemembers who remain unaccounted for from World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam.

While several nations have worked to assist the United States in search and recovery efforts, many challenges still exist when it comes to negotiations and operations. That is why today I will introduce the Keeping Our Promise to MIAs/POWs resolution that expresses a sense of Congress that any

nation seeking to potentially enter into a mutually beneficial trade agreement with the United States should provide reasonable access and cooperation to help us recover our unaccounted-for servicemembers.

This resolution sends a message that this Nation will uphold its eternal promise to our Armed Forces to always work to bring our men and women home, no matter the circumstances we face, no matter the time that has passed.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, especially in advance of Memorial Day weekend. Mr. Speaker, America will gather this weekend with family members, friends, and neighbors to remember those whom we have lost. As we raise the Stars and Stripes, as we lay wreaths at monuments and memorials and cemeteries, as we march in parades and attend services, let us remember that our freedom is thanks to those who died in sacrifice.

May God bless them, and may God bless the United States of America.

#### HONORING ALICE RIVLIN

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

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of one of the greatest public servants of any age, the indomitable Alice Rivlin, who died of cancer last week.

An intellectual giant with Midwestern sensibilities, she had a resume that would never be matched: Assistant Secretary for Policy and Evaluation at HEW, founding Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, president of the American Economic Association, and Vice Chair of the Federal Reserve.

In between her government service, she sat on a high perch at the Brookings Institution, producing rigorous, centrist, and insightful books and articles on a wide range of Federal policies.

In her spare time, she was credited with saving D.C. from bankruptcy. She never forgot her responsibility to her adopted hometown.

Alice was deeply respected and beloved by her peers and politicians of both parties. She was one of the first recipients of a MacArthur Foundation genius award, a tribute to her skill in building one of the most important public institutions of our lifetime, the CBO.

Her sustained contributions to public policy analysis have fundamentally shaped our thinking about the impact of public programs and the budget.

□ 1030

She also constantly reminded us that when we refuse to use evidence in making policy decisions, we do so at our country's peril.

Alice Rivlin was my dear friend. I met her here in D.C. as a newly minted

Ph.D. She was already famous for her classic book, "Systematic Thinking for Social Action."

She was funny, warm, generous, and welcoming. She wanted all of us newcomers to love her adopted city as much as she did.

When I returned to Washington to join the Clinton Cabinet, Alice, along with her friend Meg Greenfield, the powerhouse editorial page editor of the Post, and Post publisher Katherine Graham, formed the Smart Women's Club. They invited me to join them in hilarious dinners with interesting guests, a high point in my career.

One of my fondest memories of Alice took place on a day in the 1980s when I was still in New York. She called me and asked if I could take a month off to go to Kashmir to trek in the Himalayas. What an adventure, the beginning of decades of trekking in some of the most interesting places on Earth with friends and her patient husband, Sid Winter, himself a world-class economist.

You learn a lot about people when you share a narrow ledge in a rainstorm on some of the highest mountains in the world. Alice was tenacious, brave, cheerful, and the kindest and nicest person I have ever known.

She was a legend, renowned for mentoring younger colleagues and helping people of all walks of life with their challenges.

Hers was more than a life well lived. She was a patriot who loved her country and her city, and she served both with extraordinary skill and passion.

#### HONORING 320TH BARRAGE BALLOON BATTALION

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Memorial Day and the upcoming 75th anniversary of D-Day to recognize and raise awareness about the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion. It was an all-Black battalion that made considerable contributions during D-day.

Until recently, the 320th battalion's sacrifices and bravery have been virtually unrecognized. Until the recent book "Forgotten: The Untold Story of D-Day's Black Heroes, at Home and at War" by Linda Hervieux, the story had really gone untold. People didn't really know about it.

It is notable that one of the soldiers who is featured in the book—his name is Wilson Monk—his quote to the author when she called him was, "I've been waiting for this call for over 50 years."

When we look back at the social injustices of the 1940s during Jim Crow, it is clear that the social discrimination created momentum for the civil rights protests in the 1950s and 1960s. The lunch counter sit-ins in Montgomery and the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, the social injustices that

were in the news—sadly, always in the news—are documented very well in our textbooks, but much of the military discrimination against African Americans was not documented very well.

I want to take a minute today to thank those African American soldiers who fought during World War II for their valor and sacrifice for our country.

You may not have heard of the 320th battalion, but on the morning of June 6, 1944, the unit of African American soldiers landed on the beaches of France. Their orders were to man a curtain of armed balloons meant to deter enemy aircraft. They flew at an altitude of about 200 feet to defend soldiers landing on the beaches against strafing attacks by German aircraft. The battalion served 140 days in France.

One member of the 320th battalion wounded in battle, Waverly B. Woodson, Jr., would later be nominated for the Medal of Honor, an award he would never receive.

The Nation's highest decorations were not given to African American soldiers in World War II. Members of the 320th battalion, the first African American battalion, which included hundreds of soldiers, were sent abroad to fight for liberties denied to them at home.

The story of the 320th battalion is a narrative of perseverance in the face of injustice.

Earlier this week, I had the pleasure to be invited by Representative KATHERINE CLARK from Massachusetts to go hear the story of "D-Day Girls: The Spies Who Armed the Resistance, Sabotaged the Nazis, and Helped Win World War II" by women who played a very crucial role in the military and spycraft that helped us during World War II. Of course, throughout time, much of their role was relegated to being said that they were secretaries and answered phones, but they played very critical roles.

I know one of my former constituents who passed away not too long ago, Robert Starr, was part of an ambulatory crew that helped pick up the wounded and remains of people who were dead on the beaches of Normandy. Again, the story told was that African American soldiers worked in that role but that they were not part of the initial invasion.

Sadly, that has been memorialized in Hollywood, as well. I think one of the best movies about D-day of all time is "The Longest Day," a great, great movie. But, of course, there were no African American soldiers depicted in that movie. "Saving Private Ryan," another great movie, but, again, no African American soldiers were depicted in that movie, sadly.

It is my hope that we can raise more awareness about the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion, these men who fought so bravely during World War II, so that they, too, will not just be memorialized in the textbooks but that their story will be brought to Hollywood.

I am certain that there is a Rob Reiner or a Steven Spielberg or a Spike Lee or someone out there who will help tell the story of these women who fought during World War II and helped the resistance and also these African American soldiers whose stories have not been told.

It is absolutely amazing to me that there are many African Americans in this country even who, if you ask them, they think that there were no Black soldiers who fought during D-day. It is a story that has been allowed to be falsely perpetuated for far too long. It is time that we raise awareness about the 320th battalion and the great sacrifices that they made for this country.

#### CONGRATULATING MEL SHOWERS

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mel Showers upon his retirement from WKRG in Mobile, Alabama, after a remarkable 50-year career.

Mel holds a special place in the hearts of many in southwest Alabama and the Florida panhandle. So many grew up watching his reporting and grew to trust him over the years.

Mel's career is notable not only because of its length, but also because of the barriers he overcame to become one of the first African American reporters and, later, anchors in the Deep South. A man of lesser perseverance and integrity could not have overcome these obstacles with such grace.

Mel deserves our utmost respect, and we will miss seeing him every evening.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mel. I offer my heartfelt thanks for his many contributions to our community over the years, and I wish him the best of luck in his retirement.

#### REMEMBERING BILLY MIDDLETON

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of the longtime mayor of Loxley, Alabama, Billy Middleton. After a long, hard-fought battle, Mayor Middleton succumbed to cancer last week at 78 years old.

Billy was first elected mayor in 1988, and before his passing, he was serving a remarkable seventh term.

His longevity was no accident. A former marine, Mayor Middleton was a true public servant whose dedication to his community extended far beyond his official duties and endeared him to the people of southwest Alabama. His community is better because he was a part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my sincerest condolences to his wife, Lilly, and the many family and friends he leaves behind. Billy's memory and service to the close-knit town of Loxley will last long beyond his death.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 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 (Mr. BERA) at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend William Johnson, Immanuel United Church of Christ, Ellinwood, Kansas, offered the following prayer:

O God, we pause to recall and thank You for the blessings we have enjoyed down through the ages. These blessings You give us so often come by the hand of others.

Thank You for the Honorable men and women of the U.S. House of Representatives and all those in service of our great Nation.

As we approach Memorial Day, we gratefully remember men and women of the Armed Forces of the past, the present, and future.

Let us remember greatness is not the number of people that serve us but the number of people that we serve. Looking to past servants, let us do well the task that has been given our hands to do. May the season of graduation inspire us to grow in knowledge in order to equip ourselves as servants and citizens for God and country.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

#### WELCOMING REVEREND WILLIAM JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am often asked about what I value in life, and I speak of the four pillars of my life: faith, family, community, and education. Today I honor faith.

It is a thrill and honor of my life to have my pastor here today to help us open this Congress like we do every morning: with prayer.

I honor Pastor BILL JOHNSON and all the pastors across the country. Today, the pastor who baptized my four children, who married my daughter, we are so glad, so proud to have him lead us and open this House.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many freedoms that we value, but there is nothing I value more than freedom of religion.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### RECOGNIZING HER EMINENCE ROBIAMNY BALCACER

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Her Eminence Robiamny Balcacer, the Dominican Republic's first female Minister of Youth in the nation's history.

Since a young age, Minister Balcacer has been critical in youth political and social welfare activities within her community of Las Guaranas.

After graduating college with a bachelor's degree in business administration and a master's degree in public management and modern public administration techniques, she was elected councilwoman in 2006 and, eventually, elected president of the Councilmembers Board, becoming the youngest woman in history to lead it.

As Minister of Youth, she has quickly garnered praise for her work in low-income communities throughout the Dominican Republic. She has invested in social and workforce development programs intended to reduce crime and strengthen community relationships, including constructing brand-new community computing centers and playgrounds.

Her work has attracted the attention of Dominican American community leaders in my district and all across the country, and I had the honor of meeting Minister Balcacer this morning. I am glad that she is joining us today in the gallery as her work is being recognized here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome Minister Balcacer.

#### CONGRATULATING BRAD FARMER ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize

Brad Farmer, who has spent the last 38 years of his life in service to the Boy Scouts of America, and to congratulate him on his retirement. It is because of people like Brad that Scouting has been able to positively influence the lives of millions of young American men and women.

Brad began his service in 1981 as a district executive in Wood River, Illinois, and has served Scouting in several local and national roles since then. Brad most recently served in the National Office of the Boy Scouts, where he was Assistant Chief Scout Executive for Development from 2009 until earlier this year. Brad was also charged with overseeing the Boy Scouts of America sustainability and outdoor stewardship efforts.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years, Brad has provided incredible service and leadership. Brad leaves tremendous shoes to fill, but I congratulate him on a well deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Brad for his contributions to the Boy Scouts of America and our Nation's youth.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE CARD ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today in the midst of the Great Recession, millions of credit card holders got some needed relief when President Obama signed into law the Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility, and Disclosure Act, the CARD Act.

Before the CARD Act, some banks took advantage of their customers. For example, they raised rates and changed the terms of contracts without any notice to the customer. They even raised rates retroactively on existing balances.

The CARD Act changed that, barring many unfair and deceptive practices: no more retroactive rate hikes, no more extra fees for paying bills online or on the phone, no more aggressive marketing tactics targeting young people.

The CARD Act has saved consumers an estimated \$12 billion a year, which translates into well over \$100 billion in total savings over the past decade. It is the first 10 years, and we are celebrating this consumer protection act.

#### PROGROWTH POLICIES WORK

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the state of the economy and how progrowth policies are helping my district.

A headline last month on CNBC read: "Jobs Surge in April, Unemployment Rate Falls to the Lowest Since 1969."

The U.S. added 263,000 new hires last month, including over 13,000 jobs in North Carolina. On top of that, the labor participation rate increased. Many people are coming off the sidelines and into the workforce, and the manufacturing output continues to go up.

Mr. Speaker, when we cut taxes, slash red tape, and give employers more certainty, they are able to employ more people. This just isn't rocket science.

Just a few days ago, my district received great news. Honda Aircraft announced plans to expand its global headquarters in Greensboro by investing \$15.5 million in a new facility on its campus. This will be a huge boost for Guilford County, and that is why we cannot afford to go backwards.

Tax cuts work.

Progrowth policies work.

#### HONORING NANCY K. JOHNSON

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, this weekend we will be celebrating the life and legacy of one of my exceptional constituents, Nancy K. Johnson, who left us on January 10 of this year.

Nancy was truly a force to be reckoned with. Born in Chicago, she later moved to Santa Maria, California, with her husband, Ned, where they raised five children.

She was very active in the community and was a founding member of the Santa Maria Valley League of Women Voters, a board member and counselor at Planned Parenthood, a member of the Pismo Beach Presbyterian Church, and a nationally recognized city and county planning commissioner.

Nancy also volunteered her time with the Santa Barbara Foundation, Transitions-Mental Health, SBCAN, and the Women's Fund for North County.

She had a true passion for the arts and was a longtime supporter of PCPA community theater and the Santa Maria Symphony.

It was an honor to know and work with Nancy. Nancy will always be remembered for her passion and work towards justice and equality for all.

#### RECOGNIZING RYAN DIERKER

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a member of my staff and a constituent from Ohio's Second District, Ryan Dierker.

After 4 years in my office, Ryan will be leaving at the end of the month for a higher calling. He will be going to Officer Candidate School for the United States Marine Corps.

Ryan will surely be missed in my office, but I could not be prouder to watch this young man answer the call

to serve his country. Ryan will be joining the finest 1 percent of our Nation who have put on the uniform of the United States.

I welcome Ryan to the club, the United States military. It is the best club I ever joined, and I know he will soon agree.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ryan for his hard work in my office, but more importantly, I thank him for his service to our great Nation. I salute him.

Oohrah.

#### WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN HOUSING

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution recognizing women and minorities in housing, acknowledging their efforts in the face of historical discrimination, and promoting diversity and inclusion in business.

Although the U.S. has become more demographically diverse, the financial services industry, especially at leadership levels, remains mostly White and male.

President Johnson signed the Fair Housing Act on April 11, 1968, 1 week after the assassination of Dr. King. The Fair Housing Act was a monumental step forward for the civil rights movement and pivotal to establishing equal opportunity in housing for all Americans.

Home ownership has proven to be one of the most consistent paths to obtaining wealth in America and narrowing the wealth gap. Closing the racial wealth gap will be an essential path towards countering historic discrimination and predatory lending.

#### IN MEMORY OF RONNIE YOUNG

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is commemorating the life of Ronnie Young, who was a model public servant who genuinely loved the people he represented.

State Representative Young of Aiken County entered into rest on Sunday. He was a native of Aiken County, having made the valley community his lifelong residence. He was a member of Sweetwater Church of God.

He was a full-time legislator for District 84 in the State house. Previously, he had been elected countywide as chairman of Aiken County Council.

His civic involvement included the Graniteville Exchange Club, Aiken Rotary Club, Midland Valley Lions Club, Midland Valley Chamber of Commerce, and the Has-Been Club.

He is survived by his wife of 48 years, Susan Napier Young, and a sister, Patricia Boyd of Warrenville.

Ronnie Young will always be cherished for his successful dedication to public service.

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

#### CURRENT EXPECTED CREDIT LOSS ACCOUNTING STANDARD

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss an issue that is probably on the radar for almost everybody in this country that is watching or listening, but it involves new accounting standards being proposed called CECL.

This is supposed to put some transparency into the balance sheet for people investing in banks, but it has a far-reaching impact in credit unions, debt collection, and all sorts of other funds, including the GSEs and credit cards; yet this accounting standard is being promoted by the Federal Accounting Standards Board without any study to show whether it is going to have an impact or not on our economy and on our consumers.

The Home Builders Association says, for every \$1,000 incoming into the cost of a home loan, 100,000 people across this country will no longer have access to home loans.

What a dramatic impact on low- to moderate-income folks as well as our economy as a whole, as well as to financial institutions as a whole.

The result of this, in other words, whenever this thing is implemented, when we have a downturn in the economy and all of a sudden you have to reverse additional money because of that, it will exacerbate, in my opinion, the downturn.

This is a horrible deal. We need to take another look at it. We need to stop it and study it.

□ 1215

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 22, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 22, 2019, at 9:51 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress (2)

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

#### CONSUMERS FIRST ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1500 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 389 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. 1500.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1217

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. 1500) to require the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to meet its statutory purpose, and for other purposes, with Mr. BERA 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.

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

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act, which restores the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, so it can carry out its mission of protecting consumers from unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts or practices by financial institutions.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was created by Congress following the financial crisis in order to ensure that there is an agency in place with the sole, dedicated purpose of protecting every consumer of financial products and services and holding bad actors fully accountable when consumers are harmed.

Under the leadership of its first Director, Richard Cordray, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was a resounding success. During that time, the agency put nearly \$12 billion back in the pockets of over 30 million consumers who were harmed by financial institutions. The agency put in place important new protections so that consumers no longer had to worry about exploding mortgages, hidden prepaid card fees, or unnecessary foreclosures due to weak servicing standards.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau also helped to take the confusing jargon out of various financial



products, such as student loans, by creating tools students can use to compare financial aid and costs when deciding where to go to college.

But Donald Trump and his appointees have made it their mission to destroy the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from within. Mick Mulvaney, who was Trump's Director of the Office of Management and Budget before Trump inappropriately installed him as Acting Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, made it his mission to dismantle the agency from the inside. In fact, enforcement actions have fallen by 75 percent under Trump's appointees, there have been zero public fair lending enforcement actions, Mulvaney originally requested zero dollars from the Fed to fund the CFPB, and the number of employees at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has declined by 10 percent.

I introduced the Consumers First Act to fix the damage that Mulvaney caused at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. For example, Mulvaney stripped the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity of its supervisory enforcement powers. The Consumers First Act restores those powers.

Mulvaney fired the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's consumer advisory board. The Consumers First Act restores and strengthens the advisory panel to ensure consumers are heard by the agency's leadership.

Mulvaney stacked the senior leadership of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with ideological political appointees. The Consumers First Act limits the number of political appointees at the agency.

Mulvaney stopped the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from supervising its regulated entities for compliance with the Military Lending Act, which is in place to prevent servicemembers from being ripped off. The Consumers First Act directs the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to promptly resume Military Lending Act exams.

Mulvaney worked to hide the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's consumer complaint database from the public. The Consumers First Act requires that the consumer complaint database remain publicly accessible so that there is transparency about the complaints consumers are making about financial institutions.

H.R. 1500 puts consumers first by reversing the harmful actions Mulvaney took that we are aware of one by one. Over 50 consumer, civil rights, and labor organizations support the Consumers First Act.

The harm at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is continuing under Director Kathy Kraninger, who appears to be following Mulvaney's lead by rolling back payday lending protections and reducing the collection of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, or HMDA data, which is used to identify

discrimination in lending. And she is just getting started. Following general debate on the bill, the House will debate several amendments to undo the harmful actions taken by Director Kraninger.

Congress will not tolerate the Trump administration's anticonsumer actions, and H.R. 1500 will ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is able to fulfill its statutory mission to put consumers first.

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND  
LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTA-  
TIVES,

*Washington, DC, May 17, 2019.*

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
*Chairwoman, House Committee on Financial  
Services, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: I write concerning H.R. 1500, the "Consumers First Act." This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and secondarily to the Committee on Education and Labor. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning this bill generally, I agree to forgo consideration of the bill, so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1500, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issue within our Rule X jurisdiction.

In agreeing to forgo consideration, I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor should this bill or similar language be considered in a conference with the Senate.

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

Very truly yours,

REP. BOBBY SCOTT,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, May 21, 2019.*

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Education and  
Labor, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I writing to acknowledge your letter dated May 17, 2019, responding to our request to your Committee that it waive any jurisdictional claims over the matters contained in H.R. 1500, "the Consumers First Act," that fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee on Financial Services confirms our mutual understanding that your Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and your Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within your jurisdiction.

The Committee on Financial Services further recognizes your interest in appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor should this bill or similar language be considered in a conference with the Senate.

Pursuant to your request, I will ensure that this exchange of letters is included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during Floor

consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,  
*Chairwomen.*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since its inception, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has disregarded congressional intent in a number of alarming ways. Under the previous Director, Richard Cordray, the agency took it upon itself to essentially write law through guidance and regulate through enforcement. Bureaucrats at the CFPB worked diligently to eliminate options for Americans, arrogantly believing they were better equipped to make financial decisions than consumers themselves.

Thankfully, under Acting Director Mulvaney and Director Kraninger, the CFPB is striving to foster an environment that promotes transparency, legitimacy, and great consumer choice. The American people deserve a Bureau that enforces law rather than creates it, while placing power and choice back in the hands of consumers themselves.

Unfortunately, the legislation we are considering today accomplishes the exact opposite.

I appreciate the chairwoman's attempt to reform the Bureau and share the belief that it needs significant reform. However, instead of solving underlying issues that make the CFPB an unaccountable bureaucracy with little oversight, this legislation cherry-picks specific actions of former Acting Director Mulvaney and attempts to reverse his decisions.

Ignoring the underlying structural issues of the Bureau, Democrats are attempting to codify their CFPB agenda with respect to staffing by limiting political appointees, directing political initiatives through the creation of the Office of Students and Young Consumers, and emphasizing the powers and duties of the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity.

Yet again, my friends across the aisle are more focused on who is leading the agency than on real reforms that would increase oversight and accountability at the CFPB and could shed light on some of the issues this legislation seeks to address. For example, if the CFPB were subject to an Office of Inspector General, we would have reports on whether or not staffing levels are sufficient to fulfill the Bureau's statutory goals. If the Bureau was subject to the appropriations process, Congress would have a voice in choosing the number of political appointees at the Bureau. Some of these issues, Mr. Chairman, are not even partisan, they're near bipartisan, and yet we can't get these things done.

Instead of working with Republicans to reform the Bureau, create transparency, and avoid partisan policy shifts from Director to Director, the



majority is choosing to advance legislation that mandates the advancement of political priorities.

The bottom line here is the legislation before us is wholly partisan and does nothing to ensure the CFPB can carry out its mission to protect consumers. I oppose this legislation and I urge my colleagues to do so, as well.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) the chair of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank the chair for her strong support and leadership on the Consumers First Act, H.R. 1500. I urge everyone to vote “yes” on this if they care about protecting consumers from abuse.

Putting Mick Mulvaney in charge of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was the epitome of a fox guarding the henhouse. We have to undo all of the damage he did while he was Acting Director of the CFPB.

The CFPB was supposed to, and did, protect consumers and returned a great deal of money to consumers. All of these protections, or many of them, he deleted. What this bill does is restore these protections to consumers.

Let me remind my colleagues of why the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was created. It was after the worst financial crisis in our history, where our people lost over \$15 trillion in household wealth. They lost their homes, or they lost their jobs. It was completely preventable because those were abuses to the financial system.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was a Bureau that was directed to protect consumers. Consumers were an afterthought, a secondary thought, a third thought, or not thought about at all in financial regulation. The whole system exists for consumers, and they certainly are entitled to be protected from unfair, abusive practices.

To give an example, I was particularly concerned about his hostility to data. Decisions should be based on data. Under Director Cordray, the Bureau published a report on the effects of the Credit CARD Act, which I authored. They would publish it every 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this is an incredibly important bill, and I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD an article I wrote for The Hill about the CARD Act.

[From The Hill, May 22, 2019]

CARD ACT TURNS 10: CHANGES HAVE KEPT MONEY IN CONSUMERS’ POCKETS

(By Rep. Carolyn B. Maloney (D-N.Y.))

Ten years ago, on May 22, 2009, credit card customers got some needed relief when the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure (CARD) Act became law.

Since then, the law has saved consumers an estimated \$12 billion a year, which translates into well over \$100 billion in total savings over the past decade. As The New York Times reported, the CARD Act proved so effective that it led economists studying the law to a single conclusion: “The regulation worked.”

Before the CARD Act, some credit card companies took advantage of their customers by raising interest rates or changing the terms of their contracts without notice. Hidden terms and fees were lucrative for credit card companies but they were extremely costly to consumers. However, the new law was revolutionary, establishing strict rules for how credit card companies must treat their customers, barring many unfair practices. On the 10th anniversary of the CARD Act, it is important to remember how far we have come and also to look ahead to changes we still need to make.

So what did the CARD Act do? For starters, it protected consumers from arbitrary interest-rate increases by prohibiting retroactive rate hikes. Companies now are required to provide 45 days’ notice of a rate increase and cannot raise rates on existing balances. In the past, companies regularly increased your interest rate if your risk profile worsened—now they are required to decrease rates if your credit picture brightens. That is only fair.

But consumers were also getting socked by a host of fees, so the CARD Act introduced some commonsense changes that made it much less likely that consumers would be hit by these fees. The law requires companies to mail credit card bills at least 21 days before the due date; it prohibits companies from charging extra fees for paying online or by phone; and it requires companies to apply payments to balances with the highest interest rate first. All of these changes save consumers money.

The law protects young people from aggressive marketing tactics. Companies no longer can sell cards to individuals under the age of 21 without an adult co-signer.

The law also protects consumers when they cancel their credit card. In the past, a company could demand immediate payment of your balance. Now, a customer has five years to pay off the balance.

These important changes have kept money in consumers’ pockets. The next battle is to institute fair, common-sense regulation of the overdraft fees on bank accounts. Some financial institutions use “overdraft protection” to slap their customers with exorbitant fees. With the growing use of debit cards, it’s easier than ever to overdraw a checking account, with fees that can run as high as a 17,000 percent annual percentage rate, according to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. That’s not a financial service—it’s a robbery.

That is why, since 2005, I have been introducing legislation that would ban abusive overdraft practices like reordering transactions in order to maximize the number of fees banks can charge, and to require overdraft fees to be proportional to the size of the overdraft—no more \$35 overdraft fees for a \$2 cup of coffee. My bill would also require banks to notify consumers that a purchase or an ATM withdrawal is about to trigger an overdraft, and provide consumers with a choice of whether to accept the overdraft service and fee. That, like the CARD Act, would prevent millions of Americans from unwittingly losing money to their banks.

Opponents of the CARD Act said that trying to limit the fees credit card companies charged would prove unsuccessful and that companies would just create new fees. But that has not happened.

So when people tell me that regulation does not work and is costly, I remind them

that well-crafted consumer protections will not only work, but can save Americans tens of billions of dollars. The CARD Act is proof.

□ 1230

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for yielding.

Mr. Chair, this legislation, H.R. 1500, the so-called Consumers First Act, neither puts consumers first nor puts in place the reforms that are needed to make the CFPB a stronger and more accountable regulatory agency. In reality, this bill is an attempt to politicize consumer protection.

It represents my Democratic colleagues’ genuine expression of frustration with the current CFPB leadership, but that frustration is misdirected, Mr. Chair. That frustration really is more about their inability to provide meaningful oversight over this Bureau, a Bureau that they themselves created in the Dodd-Frank law.

I would submit that my Democratic friends’ frustration should not be directed at former Acting Director Mick Mulvaney or current Director Kathy Kraninger. Their frustration is, in fact, a product of the very structure, the very flawed structure, that they themselves created and now stubbornly defend.

Today’s legislation does absolutely nothing to address the fundamental structural flaws of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which could be remedied on a bipartisan basis with simple reforms that my Republican colleagues and I have supported since the Bureau’s creation.

I think, now that the leadership has shifted and there is a new administration with new appointees in the leadership, many of my Democratic friends are having regrets about the structure that they originally created.

What would be the reforms that we should together as a body on a bipartisan basis support? A bipartisan commission; subjecting the Bureau to congressional appropriations with my legislation, the Taking Account of Bureaucrats’ Spending Act, which would restore the power of the purse over this agency; an independent inspector general, which would hold leadership of either party accountable.

Mr. Chair, this is just a messaging bill. It is not a true attempt to legislate. This bill does nothing to get at the lack of accountability of this Bureau.

To further make this point, my friend, the chairwoman, talks about the need to add supervisory authority to the Bureau over enforcement and

compliance with the Military Lending Act, but the bill doesn't do that. I have a bill that does that. In fact, I offered the bill as an amendment, but Monday night, in the Rules Committee, they made this amendment out of order.

This is not about actually giving the Bureau supervision over the Military Lending Act. If they really wanted that, they would have approved my amendment. We would be voting on my amendment to give the Bureau supervisory authority over enforcement of the Military Lending Act.

But, no. This is just about making a political point. Sure, they have findings that there should be supervisory authority over Military Lending Act compliance. Well, then why not make this Republican amendment in order to make it a bipartisan bill?

They don't want a bipartisan bill. They want a political message.

This reaffirms our point that this legislation is not about consumer protection. It is not about putting consumers first. It is about politics. It is about giving lip service to protecting our servicemembers while excluding the necessary action to actually do it.

Mr. Chair, I encourage a "no" vote on this bill. Let's roll up our sleeves. Let's defend this institution. Let's work together in a bipartisan way to truly enact the reforms, the structural reforms that will strengthen consumer protection that will make this Bureau accountable to the American people through their elected representatives.

Let's make this a bipartisan commission. Let's give this institution, both Republicans and Democrats, the power of the purse over this agency so that when a Director from the Trump administration is in place, this body will have the ability to provide meaningful oversight, and when there is a Democratic appointee heading this agency, this body will also be able to exercise meaningful oversight.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote. Let's do real reforms. Let's not just make political points.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, we have no regrets about how we organized the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and the supervisory authority is already in law. All they have to do is implement it.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the chair of the Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development and Insurance on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for yielding, and I rise today to enthusiastically support the Consumers First Act, a bill that returns the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to its intended role as a nonpartisan consumer watchdog that elevates the interests of American taxpayers above those of special interests.

The Bureau was created by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act following the financial crisis to ensure that Americans

have a regulator working solely on their behalf in order to protect them from predatory and abusive actors. Under Director Richard Cordray's leadership, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau helped over 30 million consumers who were harmed and addressed over 1.2 million complaints about financial institutions.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development and Insurance, I am pleased to see that this critical legislation restores the supervisory and enforcement powers of the Bureau's office tasked with combating discriminatory lending practices, which have been responsible for causing the racial wealth gap to continue to grow, especially after the financial crisis of 2008.

This is a commonsense bill that, again, puts the American consumer first and ensures that, in the regular course of business and commerce, people are not forgotten.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1500. It is deceptively, and yet cleverly, named the Consumer First Act.

Let's talk some facts.

House Financial Services Committee Republicans have been trying for years to increase transparency and accountability at the CFPB. We have tried to create an Office of the Inspector General for that purpose. We have also tried to bring accountability by subjecting the CFPB to the appropriations process. Yet, despite our attempts, we have been met with opposition every single time to what used to be a bipartisan goal.

Now, today, we see a bill that my friends on the other side of the aisle are pushing that would undermine our previous efforts to shine some daylight on this agency. Rather than working with us to reform the agency and its authorities, and rather than working with us to avoid constant partisan policy shifts from Director to Director, rather than working with us in a bipartisan manner, the majority is choosing to move legislation today that simply advances their own political agenda.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, it is absolutely unbelievable that the Republicans on the opposite side of the aisle now talk about wanting to work with us after they have done everything possible to undermine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

We move ahead with restoring it from all the harm that has been done to it.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), a leading senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, this is singularly the most significant part of the Dodd-Frank legislation. It is the heart and the soul of it because it goes to protecting the American people against the abuses that have been predicated upon it.

This bill is singularly important. Let me tell Members some of the things it does.

Mr. Chair, right now, we have 44 million students, 44 million student loan borrowers, who are suffering, trying to figure out how to pay back these loans. There are predatory lenders that are out to abuse these students.

What does Ms. WATERS' bill do? It establishes a dedicated student loan office within the CFPB to protect the Nation's 44 million student loan borrowers. That is what this bill does.

Also, it emphasizes the need for a transparent and accessible consumer complaint database. We get it all the time. Consumers presently make complaints at the way they are handling the CFPB now under the Trump administration. No attention is paid to that. No transparency is there. Ms. WATERS' effort here will correct that.

Mr. Chair, this financial dynamic that we have suffered still looms large, and we need to restore the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to its rightful stature as the one premier agency that does the singular, most important thing today: protect the financial transactions of our American people.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN W. ROSE), a new member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1500.

Mr. Chair, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have Members believe that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's structure is settled law. In fact, I am certain they will continue repeating that view. However, no matter how many times they repeat the sentiment, repeating it will never make it true.

This is not settled law. The American people deserve to be represented in government entities on every level, especially those as integral to their lives as the CFPB.

I can assure you, the people of the Sixth District of Tennessee are unhappy with the structure of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and its utter lack of accountability. My constituents have expressed the same frustration time and again. The level of independence given to the CFPB is counter to the very freedoms we expect in this country.

It is our job to ensure that the American people have a voice in the business of their government. Right now, the structure of the CFPB does not provide a voice to the people of Tennessee or to the people of this country.

This is unacceptable. It is unacceptable to me, and it should be unacceptable to each of us in this Chamber.

Over 240 years ago, our forbearers fought a Revolutionary War, a War of Independence with a battle cry of, "No taxation without representation." Perhaps that battle cry today should be, "No regulation without representation."

Do we trust a fully independent bureaucrat with unlimited government funding to act in the best interests of honest, hardworking Americans, or do we trust their elected representatives?

Overwhelmingly, I trust those of us in this body to oversee the CFPB far more than we can ever rely on an independent bureaucrat to do so. We are held accountable every 2 years in this Chamber. If voters do not like the way we are doing our job, they can send us home. This matters to the American people, and it should matter to us.

H.R. 1500 does not address the real issues here: a lack of accountability, an abuse of power, and an ever-expanding footprint of the Federal Government.

Instead, H.R. 1500 attempts to micromanage the Bureau now that my friends on the other side of the aisle see what it is like when the shoe is on the other foot.

The esteemed ranking member from North Carolina and I urge our fellow Members to join us in voting against this legislation, the latest rendition of irresponsible Big Government.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, this is a consumer bill. My friends on the opposite side of the aisle who would try to kill this bill evidently do not understand that the day is over when predatory lending will go forth in this body.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), the chair of the Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion on the Financial Services Committee.

□ 1245

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her leadership and commitment to putting the consumer back in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau without regrets.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be an original sponsor of this bill because it does exactly what the title of this bill says it does. It puts consumers first. One, by restoring supervisory and enforcement authority to the Office of Fair Lending. It also establishes the student loan office—continuing—and resumes military lending examinations, all without regret.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know what my colleagues are talking about. Those are things that we need, and maybe that is why some of the people did send them back home. I do agree with my colleague on that.

This bill ensures that no matter who is running the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, there are protections that guard against a rogue Direc-

tor from dismantling it and halting its important work, as this administration has attempted to do time and time again.

Mr. Chairman, I support this because I support the workers. I support what they do for consumers. I support this legislation, and I will proudly debate anyone who thinks this chairwoman has not established legislation and policies that put consumers first.

I urge all of my colleagues, even those on the other side: Let's talk about bipartisanship. Let's get on board and vote "yes" for this.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCIA), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Consumers First Act and thank Chairwoman WATERS and Speaker PELOSI for their leadership.

I remember the housing market collapse in 2009 very clearly. I remember the foreclosure signs going up all over Chicago and in my own neighborhood of Little Village, a working-class community. Families lost homes. They skipped meals. They took second and third jobs just to scrape by. Too many families never recovered.

President Obama and the Democratic majority swore to never allow a Great Recession to happen again. Never again would we allow Wall Street to go unchecked and allow consumers to be ripped off wholesale by the big banks.

We passed sweeping legislation, Dodd-Frank, and we created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB. In short, CFPB was going to be the consumer watchdog for everyday hardworking Americans.

Since Trump's election, every day has been an assault against these protections: payday lending protections, reversed; student loan protections, reversed; predatory auto and home loan protections, reversed. Instead of protecting consumers, Trump and Mick Mulvaney have made their priorities clear: banks over people, business over the consumer.

Systematically, Mulvaney and Trump have been busy dismantling the CFPB, the same agency that recently helped a man in New York who had lost \$1,200 wrongly taken from his account. He was able to recover it thanks to the CFPB. That man is one of thousands that have been helped by the agency. That is the power of government when it is empowered to fight for every American.

Meanwhile, Mulvaney has called the CFPB's public complaint database nothing but a "yelp for financial services."

At a time when this administration is working at the behest of Wall Street, the 1 percent, and the big banks, this Democratic majority is moving forward to protect consumers.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would commend to the House that, when someone gets into fundamental issues of a 5-year term that the only way the Director can be fired is for cause. The Democrats have created an unaccountable bureau of government.

Now, I think what we have today is a bit of buyer's remorse by my Democratic colleagues who created the CFPB in order to be this unaccountable bureau, but headed by a Democrat or a Democratic Presidential appointee. Now that we have a Republican appointee in the CFPB, they want to re-order how the Director has her staff report to her.

That is what a big chunk of this bill does. They want to micromanage the Bureau because they don't like what the current Director is doing.

If we seek to actually have long-term consumer protection within our financial regulators, I think we need a bipartisan board to oversee an agency like this. I think it is a fundamentally different agency when you have a bipartisan board and it looks and acts more like the Securities and Exchange Commission that has long-term, lasting buy-in by both parties and by the American public for the enforcement actions that they take and gives investors confidence in that area.

On this side of the ledger, what we said on the Republican side during the Dodd-Frank debate and we have said consistently since then is, if you want a lasting Bureau, you need to have a bipartisan board. And funny enough, I think that was originally a bipartisan idea, and it has now become mostly a Republican idea.

What I would commend is, if we want to get into issues of reforming the Bureau, we need to get into the structural reforms about appropriations and a bipartisan board and inspector general to oversee an agency such as this rather than tinkering around the edges about reporting structures within the Bureau or the naming of the Bureau.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and always a strong leader on consumer protection issues.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman WATERS so much for yielding to me, and I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS and my former colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee for getting this important legislation, the Consumers First Act, to the floor.

The CFPB, as Members have heard, has been a great equalizer in our financial markets for regular Americans. It makes sure that financial institutions follow the law and that regular people are treated fairly.

Every business claims that they put their customers first, but what happens when they don't? For far too long, the answer was nothing.

We have seen the car loans at higher interest rates for people of color and mortgage products that almost brought our economy down and created and pushed us into the Great Recession.

Then along came Dodd-Frank and the CFPB, which set the table for the economic expansion that we have seen since 2010. The dedicated men and women of the CFPB have literally put \$12 billion back into the pockets of victims of fraud, harmful financial schemes, and other abuses.

Let me say to my colleagues on the other side: Speaker after speaker has gotten up and talked about subjecting the CFPB to the appropriations process. They have claimed that they are against the independence of the agencies, calling them independent bureaucrats. That is exactly what their comments lean toward is taking away the independence of this agency to determine fraud and abuse and subjecting it to the whims of whoever is the President or whoever is the administration.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation because it is good for consumers, good for businesses, good for our financial markets, and good for the American people.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a strong defender of consumers.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1500, a bill that will ensure the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has the necessary tools to defend American consumers.

The CFPB was created in the wake of the financial crisis as consumers fell victim to unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices.

My Republican colleagues have tried to undermine it for nearly a decade since its arrival. The Trump administration has worked to kneecap the CFPB, using a strategy that prioritizes big businesses over individual consumers. As can be seen, enforcement has decreased by 75 percent at the CFPB.

H.R. 1500 will fortify the CFPB's core mission to protect consumers and remedy the Trump administration's harmful anticonsumer tactics.

My home district lies in California's Inland Empire, and the constituents I serve understand the importance of CFPB's mission all too well. At the height of the housing crisis, one in five local households were behind on their mortgages. In 2008 alone, over 30,000 families from Riverside County lost their homes to foreclosure.

This was, however, by Wall Street's design. In no other area of the country did subprime loans aggressively pushed by lenders claim a bigger proportion of the overall mortgage market. This bill ensures the CFPB is equipped and empowered to fight this type of predatory lending and much more.

Simply put, the Consumers First Act ensures that CFPB maintains the authority and resources to do its job and proactively protect consumers from unfair, misleading, and abusive practices.

Let's pass this bill to make crystal clear that the CFPB truly does have the back of every single American consumer. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1500.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership because today's bill is about restoring effective law enforcement for consumers and protecting them from predatory Wall Street practices.

Republicans want to shield Wall Street, granting it free rein to plunder. Instead of draining the swamp, this lawless President has drained the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau of its strength. Public enforcement actions are down 75 percent. That is how they feel about law enforcement.

The President is refusing to protect our active-duty military from predatory lending; halting payments to consumers who have been wronged; eliminating the office that is designed to prevent discrimination in credit against Latinos, African Americans, and Asian Americans; and eliminating the office dedicated to addressing student loan abuses.

Enough is enough. Instead of handcuffing those who do wrong, this administration is handcuffing the agency designed to ensure law enforcement.

And while this President profited himself from scams like Trump University, it is time to restore important consumer protections: law enforcement to protect students, active military, and the retirement savings of our seniors.

In just five years, \$12 billion was returned to over 30 million American citizens. Wells Fargo would never have been penalized a penny for its multi-million-dollar fraud without a cop on the beat.

Mr. Trump and Mr. Mulvaney have been about pulling that cop back so that there is no protection for those this agency was designed to serve. Let's approve this bill to protect Americans from financial piranhas who would strip their savings to the bone.

Mr. Chair, I salute the leadership of the chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee, for standing up for Americans who have been abandoned by this administration. It is essential we do our work in Congress to say it is consumers who come first, not those who would prefer to take advantage of them.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. NORTON). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am so proud of this legislation, I am so proud of the members of the Financial Services Committee, and I am so proud of our Democratic Caucus. We have strong support for this legislation. I am so proud of the over 50 consumer, labor, and civil rights organizations who strongly support H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act.

It has been said more than once today that we went through a recession here in this country—almost a depression—in 2008 when predatory lending from the major financial institutions in America caused this recession and caused us to have communities that were devastated—boarded up homes—we had communities, not only where the homes were boarded up, but the weeds were growing up, in many instances animals had taken over the property, and many consumers and homeowners who lost these homes really did not know what had happened to them.

It was predatory lending. It was the tricks that were fostered on innocent people who simply wanted to live the American Dream and own a home. They signed on the dotted line for products and mortgages they didn't understand and could not afford. And they were led into signing on the bottom line because we had predatory lenders who wanted to get them into a situation where they could get some money, perhaps up front, and sell off the products that they were getting signed on up to Wall Street, et cetera, et cetera.

Of course, we worked for 2 years, and it was in 2010 that we were able to put the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau together, which is indeed the centerpiece of the Dodd-Frank reforms. So we had Mr. Cordray who was our first Director who did a magnificent job, and it has been cited here time and time again.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle have done everything that they could do to dismantle the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and, Madam Chair, none of them are going to vote for this bill today. None of them will criticize the big banks on Wall Street and others who took advantage of our consumers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, I inquire from Chairwoman WATERS if she is prepared to close.

Ms. WATERS. No, I am not prepared to close.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the chair of the full committee. I am honored to have this opportunity to speak in support of this bill.

This bill addresses a concern that many of us on the Financial Services Committee have had to deal with for some time now, and it is the question of whether the committee is going to allow the CFPB to protect consumers from unscrupulous behavior or to protect Big Business. I am a person who believes that we should protect the consumer.

This legislation will allow the persons who receive student loans to avoid being placed into costly repayment plans that will cause them to pay more money and possibly default. It will cause consumers looking to open a new checking account to have the opportunity to do so with a bank that has the least amount of overdraft fees. It will allow persons who are seeking credit cards to have the right to seek relief through the courts, not through some boilerplate language that they might find in a contract that will not benefit them.

This is the opportunity that we must take advantage of to protect consumers. It is the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, not the financial institutions protection bureau.

So with this said, I wholeheartedly endorse what the chairperson has brought to the attention of this Congress. These are remedies that are absolutely necessary, and I plan to vote and encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say that we send a message from this House today, and our message that we are sending out across this Nation is that we are now in a position to undo what has been done and the wreckage that has been caused with our Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

We send a message that the day for predatory lending is over.

We send the message despite the fact that we have Members of this House who would dare not stand up for students and servicemembers and not criticize what has happened to consumers in the way that it has happened in this country. And so I want that message to be loud and clear.

I want those on Wall Street and the major banks who had the predatory products and who had the exotic loans, I want all those who mismanaged the way that they deal with our students

when our students had complaints and they looked for someone to help them. I want all of them to know, well, I suppose, there is a new sheriff in town.

We are going to make sure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is strong, that it is not simply made up of political appointees, and that they do not have to worry in the way that they are worrying now. We have personnel who have quit the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau because it was not carrying out the mission that was intended.

Again, I have said earlier how proud I am to have this bill on the floor and to have the support of the Democratic Caucus.

I would just ask my friends on the opposite side of the aisle to think about what is going on and to think about ways that they can begin to take into consideration their constituents who need protection, and prior to our legislation there was no protection for consumers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What I would say, Madam Chair, is that this bill does nothing to protect consumers. This is all about the reporting structure, the organization chart within the CFPB. In fact, in 21 pages of findings in this bill, the next 21 pages of legislative text does nothing to answer the fundamental questions raised in the first 21 pages.

Moreover, the reforms that are necessary weren't even considered by the Democrat majority. So we want to protect consumers. I think we all want to protect consumers. Where there is malfeasance and where there is wrongdoing, we will seek it out and we will have bipartisan cooperation for that proper oversight by this branch of government.

One area where we can have bipartisan work is the Military Lending Act. We want to make sure that those who are serving in the Armed Forces are protected by those who seek to do financial wrongdoing and perpetrate financial wrongdoing. This is an area where Congressman ANDY BARR of Kentucky has authored a bill. He offered it as an amendment—and it was rejected by the Rules Committee—that would have made this otherwise subpar bill much better in effect, and it would have actually had a positive impact on the people whom we all seek to protect.

I think it is important that our colleagues understand part of the reason why we should oppose this bill. I am prepared to close, but I will wait for the majority to finish with their speakers before I will do so, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her great work on this bill. She has been a

true champion on behalf of consumers during her time in Congress.

This chart shows the decrease in enforcement actions which have plummeted by 75 percent under the Office of Management and Budget Director Mulvaney. Bear in mind that corruption and abuse of consumers has not gone away. This is a time period when Wells Fargo—a perfect example—robbed their customers, opened up fake accounts to basically take the proceeds, used their—this is when customers went to Wells Fargo, gave them all their information, Wells Fargo used their Social Security numbers and data to open up fake accounts, so they could charge their own customers—flat-out theft—and they had to fire 5,300 employees. That doesn't happen by accident. That is a business model that is built on abusing the consumer.

That is why the CFPB is necessary, and that is why we need to pass this bill today. I support the chairwoman's efforts in this regard.

A dramatic decline is evident, from 54 cases in the Obama administration to 11 this year. The sheriff has basically left the street. There is no more cop on the beat now with respect to protecting the consumer.

Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for giving me this time to point out the need for the Consumers First Act, a great bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 15½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, let me close by saying what I said briefly in debate. This bill is about buyer's remorse.

I would say to my colleague from Massachusetts who raised the issue about Wells Fargo, there was a bipartisan hearing. Chairwoman WATERS called the hearing. We had bipartisan questioning of the Wells Fargo CEO. We have taken bipartisan work on the oversight of regulators and the regulated when it came to malfeasance by Wells Fargo and some of the employees who were within that firm. There was a bipartisan level of cooperation there.

I would also highlight, to my colleague from Massachusetts, that it was not the regulators who found the malfeasance of Wells Fargo, it was the good and wise reporting of the Los Angeles Times. Through investigative journalism, they found the malfeasance, the bad actors, and the bad policies within Wells Fargo—not the regulators. That is a failure of the regulators. It is a failure of the CFPB. We have yet to have a hearing about those failures.

Let me say from the outset about this bill; it proves what Republicans have said since the passage of Dodd-Frank: the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is unaccountable.

We hear my Democrat colleagues complain about the actions of a legal overseer of the Bureau, Mick Mulvaney, and now the complaints about the Republican-appointed Director, Kathy Kraninger. We are here today because Democrats regret that during Dodd-Frank they didn't go far enough by mandating outcomes by this Bureau, because they didn't consider that a Republican could actually be a leader of that Bureau and they may not like the action of that unaccountable Director.

They have buyer's remorse, and, unfortunately, they have decided to advance legislation that does nothing to create a more responsible CFPB over the long term. Instead of taking this opportunity to work together, to bring transparency and accountability to the CFPB, the majority is moving a bill that does little more than advance their political agenda and micro-manage the Bureau.

H.R. 1500 codifies and recreates offices inside the CFPB, some of which are given more authority and some of which, like the Office of Cost Benefit Analysis, are given less.

H.R. 1500 actually directs what Bureau staff can refer to the Bureau as in public. Now, let me explain: if it is called the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under this bill, it is okay. If it is called the CFPB, that is okay. If it is referred to as the Bureau, a law has actually been broken under this bill.

□ 1315

That is one of the more substantive changes in the bill, actually. I don't think it is wise legislating by Congress.

That represents the policy side of the legislation. One look at this bill's findings is enough to tell Members what H.R. 1500 is really about.

There are more pages of findings than there are of actual legislative text. The issues they raise in the findings sections, however, are not remedied in the legislative text part of the bill.

In a series of disparaging statements, former Acting Director Mick Mulvaney, a former colleague of ours here in the House and member of the Financial Services Committee, and Director Kathy Kraninger are vilified as irresponsible zealots.

Specifically, the text describes former Acting Director Mulvaney as "anticonsumer," "destructive," and "inane," only working "to hamstring the good work, passion, and the capacity of dedicated staff."

The findings also opine that "the appointment of Mr. Mulvaney aimed to diminish and undermine the mission of the Consumer Bureau."

This is a highly suspect section of legislation before this House. I don't think it is becoming of this House to opine in this way.

While Mick Mulvaney may be many things, he is not inane nor is he anticonsumer. Now, I may say, jok-

ingly, that I find him destructive, probably destructive with his humor, but not destructive in the work that he achieves in public policy. I think he is a good public servant, serving our country admirably; and, with the work that he did at the Bureau, he was trying to achieve the best results possible for consumers, for institutions, for financial safety and soundness, and for the economy at large. He did good work.

With that context in mind, we know that this bill is not about helping consumers. This bill is about constraining Republican Directors from making decisions they believe are in the best interest of the agency.

In the Financial Services Committee markup, Republicans offered amendments that would have made responsible changes to the Bureau. Had those amendments been adopted, the majority would have a much better bill.

An inspector general would have provided oversight of the Director, ensuring the mission of the agency is not undermined. That is important for all branches of government.

Subjecting the Bureau to annual appropriations would have also ensured congressional oversight of the CFPB, or the Bureau, and a voice in the prioritization of Bureau functions.

A GAO study examining the efficacy in which the Bureau meets its statutory obligations would have actually yielded insight into the workings of the otherwise opaque Bureau.

But those amendments were not adopted. The choice was made to move forward with a partisan declaration instead of meaningful bipartisan legislation. That is unfortunate.

Thankfully, there will be a Senate, and the Senate has a different view on this. It is my hope that this bill does not become law.

Unfortunately, we can't improve this legislation through a meaningful amendment process because of the nature of the rule passed by the Rules Committee.

We are merely adding more political fodder for press releases as a result of this bill. H.R. 1500 will pass the House and will go nowhere in the Senate.

The Financial Services Committee will then turn to the next issue. Hopefully, it is bipartisan legislating, where Chairwoman WATERS and I have had success in the past, and I hope we have success in the future.

But, to the American people, I say that the Financial Services Committee Republicans remain committed to bettering this organization of the CFPB. We will protect consumers, while maximizing financial choice. We will work to advance solutions, not sound bites. It is my sincere hope that we can do that with cooperation from the majority.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1500, legislation that puts politics first, not consumers.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I am so proud that, today, we are going to stand up for consumers on this side of the aisle. It is unfortunate that our friends on the opposite side of the aisle have not seen fit to support consumers. They will all vote against this bill. We will vote for this bill on this side of the aisle.

Madam Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to come to the floor quickly and vote for consumer financial protection, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-15, shall be considered as adopted and shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1500

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Consumers First Act".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings; sense of Congress.
- Sec. 3. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.
- Sec. 4. Conforming amendments.
- Sec. 5. Executive and administration powers.
- Sec. 6. Offices of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.
- Sec. 7. Consumer Advisory Board reforms.
- Sec. 8. Discretionary surplus funds.
- Sec. 9. Effective date.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203) ("Dodd-Frank"), was signed into law on July 21, 2010, in order to, among other things, advance the goals of protecting consumers from predatory financial services practices and products that led to the 2007-2009 financial crisis.

(2) Title X of Dodd-Frank established a new Federal independent watchdog, known as the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ("Consumer Bureau"), with broad authority to ensure that all hardworking consumers are given clear, accurate information that they need to shop for mortgages, credit cards, and other consumer financial products or services and to protect consumers from hidden fees, abusive terms, and other unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts or practices through strong implementation and enforcement of Federal consumer financial laws.

(3) Before the Consumer Bureau was established, Federal financial regulators were tasked with the dual responsibilities of supervising institutions for safety and soundness and compliance with consumer protections under Federal consumer financial laws. These agencies often prioritized the profitability of their regulated entities over the protection of consumers, even when institutions were found to have engaged in practices detrimental to their own customers' financial well-being.

(4) Congress purposefully created the independent Consumer Bureau within the Federal



Reserve System to address past regulatory gaps in our country's financial regulatory regime—gaps that resulted in the most severe global financial crisis since the Great Depression. Among other things, Federal financial regulators were too reluctant to exercise their rule-making, supervisory, and enforcement authorities to protect consumers from the misdeeds of the Consumer Bureau's regulated entities. In creating the Consumer Bureau, Congress explicitly laid out in statute the Consumer Bureau's purpose, five objectives, and six primary functions. Specifically:

(A) Section 1021(a) of Dodd-Frank states that the Consumer Bureau, "shall seek to implement and, where applicable, enforce Federal consumer financial law consistently for the purpose of ensuring that all consumers have access to markets for consumer financial products and services and that markets for consumer financial products and services are fair, transparent, and competitive".

(B) Section 1021(b) of Dodd-Frank authorizes the Consumer Bureau, "to exercise its authorities under Federal consumer financial law for the purposes of ensuring that, with respect to consumer financial products and services—(1) consumers are provided with timely and understandable information to make responsible decisions about financial transactions; (2) consumers are protected from unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts and practices and from discrimination; (3) outdated, unnecessary, or unduly burdensome regulations are regularly identified and addressed in order to reduce unwarranted regulatory burdens; (4) Federal consumer financial law is enforced consistently, without regard to the status of a person as a depository institution, in order to promote fair competition; and (5) markets for consumer financial products and services operate transparently and efficiently to facilitate access and innovation."

(C) Section 1021(c) of Dodd-Frank establishes the primary functions of the Consumer Bureau to be, "(1) conducting financial education programs; (2) collecting, investigating, and responding to consumer complaints; (3) collecting, researching, monitoring, and publishing information relevant to the functioning of markets for consumer financial products and services to identify risks to consumers and the proper functioning of such markets; (4) subject to sections 1024 through 1026, supervising covered persons for compliance with Federal consumer financial law, and taking appropriate enforcement action to address violations of Federal consumer financial law; (5) issuing rules, orders, and guidance implementing Federal consumer financial law; and (6) performing such support activities as may be necessary or useful to facilitate the other functions of the Bureau."

(5) In doing so, Congress explicitly laid out these consumer-focused purpose, objectives, and primary functions for the Consumer Bureau to ensure that all consumers and all communities are protected. This is of extreme importance to communities of color who have been disproportionately impacted by the inequities of the financial system, resulting in an extreme racial wealth divide. Decades of segregation and discrimination have prevented consumers of colors from amassing wealth equal to their white counterparts, while predatory financial practices of have stripped consumers of color of their nominal existing wealth. For example, over the past 30 years, the average wealth of White families has grown by 84 percent—1.2 times the rate of growth for the Latino population and three times the rate of growth for the Black population. In light of historical practices and current-day disparities in banking and lending practices, the Consumer Bureau plays a key role in protecting communities of color from wealth-stripping financial products and ensuring their right to wealth building opportunities. The agency's enforcement actions in auto lending, mortgages, and credit cards, and its rulemaking efforts have sought to address the predatory fi-

nancial products such as payday loans and prepaid cards that are prolific in communities of color. The Consumer Bureau is essential in protecting vulnerable communities from discriminatory financial practices that has both perpetuated and exacerbated the racial wealth gap.

(6) Under Dodd-Frank, the Deputy Director of the Consumer Bureau shall serve as the Acting Director in the absence or unavailability of the Director, until the President appoints and the Senate confirms a new Director. Despite the plain letter of the law establishing a succession order to fill a vacancy in the Director's position and the clear legislative history underscoring the importance of having an independent Federal consumer-focused agency, when the Consumer Bureau Director Richard Cordray resigned in November 2017, President Trump refused to recognize the Deputy Director as the rightful head of the agency and instead installed Mr. Mick Mulvaney, the Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget, to serve as the Consumer Bureau's Acting Director. This appointment of a White House cabinet official to run the Consumer Bureau raises profound conflict of interest questions and undermines the vital independent nature of the agency.

(7) Additionally, the position of Acting Director is, by its nature, intended to be a temporary assignment to maintain the status quo at an agency and to ensure the agency is fulfilling its statutory purpose and mandates, until the President appoints, and the Senate confirms a permanent Director. Nevertheless, during his tenure, Mr. Mulvaney instituted drastic and severe changes to the Consumer Bureau's daily operations and priorities contrary to the agency's statutory purpose and mandates.

(8) The daily operations of a Federal agency are guided by its official mission contained in its long-term strategic plan. The Consumer Bureau's mission should embrace both the spirit and plain letter of the law by fully recognizing the agency's statutory purpose, objectives, and functions. It is troubling that the Consumer Bureau, under Mr. Mulvaney, issued a Strategic Plan for Fiscal Year ("FY") 2018-FY 2022 that appears to deemphasize the Consumer Bureau's core mandate under section 1021(a) of Dodd-Frank to, "enforce Federal consumer financial law consistently for the purpose of ensuring that all consumers have access to markets for consumer financial products and services", by not referencing the importance of enforcement in its mission. Instead, it emphasizes financial education by stating that the agency's new mission is, "[t]o regulate the offering and provision of consumer financial products or services under the Federal consumer financial laws and to educate and empower consumers to make better informed financial decisions". This is in stark contrast from the Consumer Bureau's Strategic Plan for FY 2013-FY 2017, which stated that the agency's mission is helping, "consumer finance markets work by making rules more effective, by consistently and fairly enforcing those rules, and by empowering consumers to take more control over their economic lives" (emphasis added).

(9) Mr. Mulvaney has been praised by the White House for his efforts to undermine the Consumer Bureau, with one anonymous advisor acknowledging in a July 24, 2018, Politico article that, "His mission was to blow that up, which he has. He is very well-suited to the chaos." Mr. Mulvaney's misguided actions have included, among other things—

(A) stopping payments from the Civil Penalty Fund to harmed consumers;

(B) trying to reduce the Consumer Bureau's funding and staffing by initially requesting \$0 be transferred from the Federal Reserve Board of Governors to carry out the agency's work, imposing a freeze on hiring professional career staff, and by arbitrarily directing staff to cut the agency's budget by 1/5;

(C) politicizing the work of the Consumer Bureau by making unusual efforts to fill the independent agency with political appointees;

(D) reducing the Consumer Bureau's enforcement work, including taking only six enforcement actions in the first three quarters of 2018 (compared with 54 enforcement actions taken by the agency in 2015, 42 enforcement actions in 2016 and 36 enforcement actions in 2017), and dropping existing lawsuits and investigations into predatory payday lenders;

(E) taking steps that would undermine efforts to promote fair lending and combat discriminatory practices, including by hiring, and later refusing to remove, a political appointee with a history of racist written commentary to oversee the Office of Supervision, Enforcement, and Fair Lending, stripping away the enforcement powers of the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity, seeking to curb the Consumer Bureau's data collection under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, and indicating the Consumer Bureau would reconsider its approach toward enforcing the Equal Credit Opportunity Act;

(F) changing the role of the Office of Students and Young Consumers and, according to an August 27, 2018, resignation letter from Seth Frotman, the Consumer Bureau's former Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman, "when new evidence came to light showing that the nation's largest banks were ripping off students on campuses across the country by saddling them with legally dubious account fees, Bureau leadership suppressed the publication of a report prepared by Bureau staff";

(G) abandoning the accepted and efficient practice of having its examiners review, as part of their routine examinations, creditors' compliance with the Military Lending Act in order to ensure the detection and assessment of risky activities that could jeopardize vital protections provided to active-duty servicemembers and their families;

(H) creating an Office of Cost Benefit Analysis that prioritizes businesses' expenses over harm caused to consumers, and unduly constrains oversight of the Consumer Bureau's regulated entities;

(I) freezing data collection to the detriment of supervision and enforcement;

(J) seeking to block the publication of the nature of consumers' complaints and how entities resolved them in the publicly available and transparent Consumer Complaint Database;

(K) restricting key input and feedback from a wide range of external stakeholders by effectively terminating members' positions on three advisory boards, including the statutorily mandated Consumer Advisory Board;

(L) proposing policies, including those regarding no-action letters, model disclosure pilot projects, and product sandboxes, that could put many kinds of financial institutions in an enforcement-free zone, letting bad actors that harm consumers off the hook entirely from enforcement, and allowing them to ignore the law; and

(M) neglecting to impose promptly any civil money penalty on a bank when it was found to be, among other things, improperly obtaining consumer reports and furnishing to consumer reporting agencies inaccurate information about consumers' credit.

(10) The repeated efforts under Mr. Mulvaney's leadership to hamstringing the good work, passion, commitment, and the capacity of dedicated professional, career Consumer Bureau staff to fulfill the agency's statutory mission has likely contributed to low employee morale. According to a government-wide annual survey published in December 2018 that was conducted by the nonprofit, nonpartisan Partnership for Public Service, the Consumer Bureau experienced the largest decline in employee morale for a government agency of its size. A workplace with low morale undermines, among other things, the agency's ability to hold bad actors accountable when they harm consumers, and if



unaddressed, will distort the functioning of fair and competitive consumer marketplaces.

(11) Despite the fact that the agency has been referred to as the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau since it was created in 2010, Mr. Mulvaney opted to change the agency's well-known name. Although this decision is supposedly intended to ensure that the agency is in compliance with Dodd-Frank, when this change is viewed in conjunction with the other detrimental actions to undermine the effectiveness of the agency, it can only be interpreted as an attempt to reduce the public's awareness of, and significant support for, the agency's role as the top Federal consumer cop as well as to obscure the public's ability to easily identify the appropriate Federal agency to contact when faced with predatory behavior by financial actors. As such, while some may view this particular decision as minor, the action served as an important symbolic and literal maneuver by the Trump Administration, through its appointment of Mr. Mulvaney, to diminish and undermine the consumer-focused mission of the Consumer Bureau. Director Kathy Kraninger, who was duly nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, announced plans in an email to staff on December 19, 2018, to reverse course and return to utilizing the agency's well-known name. However, questions remain regarding how this change will be implemented and to what extent the agency may continue to utilize Mr. Mulvaney's preferred name in certain circumstances.

(12) During Mr. Mulvaney's more than 12-month tenure running the agency, he only appeared once before the House Financial Services Committee to discuss his activities at the Consumer Bureau. This is despite the fact that the law requires, at a minimum, the Director's testimony before the Committee semi-annually. This weak congressional oversight under the direction of the previous Republican Majority pales in comparison to their oversight of the Consumer Bureau during former Director Richard Cordray's tenure. During Director Cordray's tenure, he and other senior Consumer Bureau officials testified before Congress more than 60 times; the agency was compelled to produce more than 200,000 pages of documents in response to over 90 letters of inquiry; more than 20 subpoenas were sent to the Consumer Bureau; and several of the Consumer Bureau's former and current employees were compelled to sit for depositions over 21 days, that lasted 136 hours, and produced 3,194 pages of transcripts.

(13) Dodd-Frank gives the Director of the Consumer Bureau broad administrative and executive powers to, among other things: fix the number of, and appoint and direct, all employees of the agency; direct the establishment and maintenance of divisions or other offices within the agency; determine the character of, and the necessity for, the obligations and expenditure of funds; and the use and expenditure of funds. These powers, however, are required to be exercised in a manner consistent with carrying out the responsibilities under Title X of Dodd-Frank, which includes complying with the enumerated Federal consumer financial laws under the Title, and satisfying the obligations in other applicable laws. Mr. Mulvaney's destructive actions have demonstrated the need for legislation to reorient the Director's discretionary authority to ensure the maintenance of all statutorily mandated policies, functions, and offices of the Consumer Bureau regardless of who is leading the agency.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The following is the sense of Congress:

(1) The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau should meet its statutory purpose in a transparent and accountable manner by operating in a way that is consistent with both the spirit and plain letter of the law. This includes the agency fully carrying out the agency's statutory purpose, objectives, and functions, and

the agency being transparent, timely, and responsive to all requests from Congress.

(2) Dodd-Frank underscores that the agency is designed to serve as an independent Federal agency that is primarily focused on the protection of all consumers, without any undue influence of partisan whims and special industry interests, in carrying out its responsibilities and duties.

(3) The official name of the agency should be consistent with this mandate, and the agency should, figuratively and literally, put "Consumers" first by using its better-known name as the "Consumer Financial Protection Bureau". Thus, any remaining utilization by the agency of the name, "Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection", or the acronym "BCFP", should cease in all forms.

(4) The statute establishing the Consumer Bureau has been grossly misinterpreted under Mr. Mulvaney's leadership, in a manner that is inconsistent with the agency's statutory purpose, objectives, and functions. One example of this was Mr. Mulvaney's inane suggestion that the statutory requirement for the Director to appear before relevant Congressional Committees to discuss its semi-annual reports could be interpreted as requiring the Director merely to attend a hearing and not answer questions, despite the well-established interpretation of a similar statutory requirement for the Chair of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors to appear before the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee on a semi-annual basis about the monetary policy report, as required by the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act. In the face of such blatant and disrespectful attempts to warp the authorizing and oversight role of the first branch of the Federal Government—the United States Congress—by the Trump Administration, Congress must, in this instance, now refine the Consumer Bureau's authority to ensure that the vital role that the Consumer Bureau should be playing within the country's financial regulatory regime is not effectively destroyed by the agency's current leadership.

(5) The Consumer Bureau, now under a new Director, should promptly reverse all anti-consumer actions taken during Mr. Mulvaney's tenure, including the actions identified by this legislation, to ensure that the agency is fully complying with its statutory purpose, objectives, and functions to protect all consumers, including communities of color and vulnerable populations. One important action is for the Consumer Bureau to resume robust fair lending enforcement to ensure that every consumer has fair and equal access to affordable financial products and services. Another demonstration of this would be for the Consumer Bureau to immediately resume supervision of its regulated entities for compliance with the Military Lending Act to ensure for the most robust and efficient protection of active-duty servicemembers and their families. Other examples include the Consumer Bureau significantly revising its strategic plan to align it with its statutory purpose, objectives and functions, and for the agency to immediately resume coordinating closely with other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Education and the Department of Defense, and State regulators, as is required by section 1015 of Dodd-Frank to, "promote consistent regulatory treatment of consumer financial and investment products and services."

(6) While the legislation is a direct response to address many of the misguided decisions that have been orchestrated under Mr. Mulvaney's leadership at the Consumer Bureau that have been exposed to the public, as of the date of the bill's introduction, and sharply criticized by numerous Federal and State officials, including law enforcement, as well as organizations representing servicemembers, senior citizens, and other vulnerable consumer populations, this legislation should not be viewed as an exhaustive list to fix all the damaging actions that may

have occurred at this agency since the departure of former Director Cordray in November 2017, particularly since detailed information revealing the full scope, nature, and extent of the current flawed operation of the agency, and the adverse impact resulting from these actions, may not yet be publicly available. Rather, this legislation should be interpreted as an attempt to highlight and resolve a small sample of the publicly known egregious statements, decisions, and actions that have occurred since November 2017.

### SEC. 3. CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1011(a) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491(a)) is amended by striking "Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection" and inserting "Consumer Financial Protection Bureau".

(b) DEEMING OF NAME.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the "Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection" shall be deemed a reference to the "Consumer Financial Protection Bureau".

(c) NAME USE REQUIREMENT.—Section 1011 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) NAME USE REQUIREMENT.—The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall refer to itself in any public communication, including on any website, as the 'Consumer Financial Protection Bureau' or the 'CFPB'."

### SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Acts and provisions described under subsection (b) are amended by striking "Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection" each place such term appears (including in headings and items in table of contents) and inserting "Consumer Financial Protection Bureau".

(b) ACTS TO CONFORM.—The Acts and provisions described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) The Alternative Mortgage Transaction Parity Act of 1982 (12 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).

(2) The Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(3) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

(4) The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(5) The Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 et seq.).

(6) The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(7) The Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1811 note et seq.).

(8) The Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9701 et seq.).

(9) Section 626 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2009 (Division D of Public Law 111–8; 12 U.S.C. 5538).

(10) The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (12 U.S.C. 1811 note et seq.).

(11) The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.).

(12) Section 10(a)(4) of the Homeowners Protection Act of 1998 (12 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.).

(13) The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App 2).

(14) The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(15) The Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.).

(16) Title LXII of the Revised Statutes of the United States (12 U.S.C. 21 et seq.).

(17) The Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.).

(18) The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.).

(19) The Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(20) Sections 552a(w) and 3132(a)(1)(D) of title 5, United States Code.

(21) Section 987(g)(3)(E) of title 10, United States Code.

(22) Sections 3502(5) and 3513(c) of title 44, United States Code.

# **SEC. 5. EXECUTIVE AND ADMINISTRATION POWERS.**

(a) **OFFICE RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Section 1012 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5492) is amended—

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

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

“(c) **OFFICE RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), section 1013(a), and any other provision of law, with respect to the specific functional units and offices described under subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 1013 and the advisory boards described under section 1014, the Director—

“(1) shall ensure that such functional units, offices, and boards perform the functions, duties, and coordination assigned to them under the applicable provision of section 1013 or 1014; and

“(2) may not reorganize or rename such units, offices, and boards in a manner not provided for under the applicable provision of section 1013 or 1014.”.

(b) **DUTY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE STAFFING.**—Section 1013(a)(1) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **DUTY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE STAFFING.**—The Director shall ensure that the specific functional units and offices described under subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 1013, as well as other units and offices with supervisory and enforcement duties, are provided with sufficient staff to carry out the functions, duties, and coordination of those units and offices.”.

(c) **LIMITATION ON POLITICAL APPOINTEES.**—Section 1013(a)(1) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) **LIMITATION ON POLITICAL APPOINTEES.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—In appointing employees of the Bureau who are political appointees, the Director shall ensure that the number and duties of such political appointees are as similar as possible to those of the other Federal primary financial regulatory agencies.

“(ii) **POLITICAL APPOINTEES DEFINED.**—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘political appointee’ means an employee who holds—

“(I) a position which has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character;

“(II) a position in the Senior Executive Service as a noncareer appointee (as such term is defined in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code); or

“(III) a position under the Executive Schedule (subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code).”.

(d) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF COMPLAINT INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1013(b)(3) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493(b)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting “publicly available” before “website”;

(ii) by inserting “publicly available” before “database”, each place such term appears; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “The Director shall ensure that the landing page of the main website of the Bureau contains a clear and conspicuous hyperlink to the consumer complaint database described in this subparagraph and shall ensure that such database is user-friendly and in plain writing (as such term is defined in the Plain Writing Act of 2010). The Director shall ensure that all information on the website or the database that explains how to file a complaint with the Bureau, as well as all re-

ports of the Bureau with respect to information contained in the database, shall be provided in each of the 5 most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the United States, as determined by the Bureau of the Census on an ongoing basis, and in formats accessible to individuals with hearing or vision impairments.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall—

“(I) make all consumer complaints available to the public on a website of the Bureau;

“(II) place a clear and conspicuous hyperlink on the landing page of the main website of the Bureau to the website described under subclause (I); and

“(III) ensure that such website—

“(aa) is searchable and sortable by both consumer financial product or service and by covered person; and

“(bb) is user-friendly and written in plain language.

“(ii) **INCLUSION OF COMPLAINTS SUBMITTED WITH INQUIRIES.**—For purposes of clause (i), in addition to all complaints described under subparagraph (A), consumer complaints shall include any complaints submitted with, or as part of, an inquiry described under section 1034.

“(iii) **REMOVAL OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.**—In making the information described under clause (i) available to the public, the Director shall remove all personally identifiable information.”.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall ensure—

(i) that the database and website described under section 1013(b)(3) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 have, at a minimum, the same availability, transparency, and functionality that such database and website had prior to November 24, 2017; and

(ii) that consumers are able, at a minimum, to submit complaints to the Bureau with respect to—

(I) any covered person or service provider; and

(II) any financial product or service.

(B) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the terms “covered person”, “financial product or service”, and “service provider” have the meaning given those terms, respectively, under section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010.

(e) **MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.**—

(1) **REPORT ON CURRENT MOUS.**—Not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall issue a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate listing—

(A) each memorandum of understanding in effect with the Bureau on November 24, 2017;

(B) any changes made to such a memorandum of understanding since such date, including any memorandum of understanding rescinded since such date; and

(C) a justification for each such change or rescission.

(2) **SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT ON MOUS.**—Section 1016(c) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) a list of each memorandum of understanding in effect with the Bureau, any changes made to a memorandum of understanding since the last report was made under subsection (b), and a justification for each such change.”.

(f) **ADDITIONAL REPORT INFORMATION ON CONSUMER SAVINGS.**—Section 1013 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **ADDITIONAL REPORT INFORMATION ON CONSUMER SAVINGS.**—In issuing each report required under section 502(d) of the Credit CARD Act of 2009, the Bureau shall include a numerical estimate of the amount that such Act has saved consumers in fees impacted by such Act, relative to the level of such fees prior to the enactment of such Act.”.

# **SEC. 6. OFFICES OF THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU.**

(a) **CLARIFICATION OF THE DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF FAIR LENDING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY.**—Section 1013(c)(2) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity shall have such powers and duties as the Director may delegate to the Office, including” and inserting “powers and duties of the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity shall include”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) implementing the Bureau’s enforcement and supervisory authority with respect to fair lending laws; and

“(F) such additional powers and duties as the Director may determine appropriate.”.

(b) **OFFICE OF STUDENTS AND YOUNG CONSUMERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1013 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493), as amended by section 5(f), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **OFFICE OF STUDENTS AND YOUNG CONSUMERS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall, not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this section, establish an Office of Students and Young Consumers, which shall work to empower students, young people, and their families to make more informed financial decisions about saving and paying for college, accessing safer and more affordable financial products and services, all matters related to private education loans (as defined under section 1035(e)), and repaying student loan debt, including private education loans.

“(2) **HEAD OF THE OFFICE.**—The head of the Office of Students and Young Consumers shall be the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman, and the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman shall carry out all functions established under section 1035 through the Office of Students and Young Consumers.

“(3) **SUPERVISORY, ENFORCEMENT, AND REGULATORY MATTERS.**—The Office of Students and Young Consumers shall assist in all supervisory, enforcement, and regulatory matters of the Bureau related to the functions of the Office.

“(4) **COORDINATION.**—The Director shall enter into memoranda of understanding and similar agreements with the Department of Education and other Federal and State agencies, as appropriate, in order to carry out the business of the Office of Students and Young Consumers.”.

(2) **RENAMING AND APPOINTMENT CLARIFICATION OF THE PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN OMBUDSMAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1035 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5535) is amended—

(i) in the heading of the section by striking “PRIVATE EDUCATION” and inserting “ASSISTANT DIRECTOR AND STUDENT”;

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking “The Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall designate a Private Education Loan Ombudsman” and inserting “The Director shall designate an individual as the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman”;

(iii) in subsection (b), by striking “The Secretary and the Director” and inserting “The Director”;

(iv) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting “the Director,” before “the Secretary.”

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents under section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is amended, in the item relating to section 1035, by striking “Private education” and inserting “Assistant director and student”.

(C) DEMING OF NAME.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the “Private Education Loan Ombudsman” shall be deemed a reference to the “Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman”.

(c) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON CERTAIN OFFICES OF THE BUREAU.—Section 1016(c) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496(c)), as amended by section 5(e)(2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) with respect to each of the specific functional units and offices established under section 1013—

“(A) a detailed description of the activities of the unit or office since the last report was made under subsection (b); and

“(B) an analysis of the efforts of the Bureau to achieve the duties of the unit or office; and

“(12) with respect to each specific functional unit and offices established under section 1013, as well as each other unit and office with supervisory and enforcement duties, a break down of the number of political and professional career staff assigned to and employed by each unit or office at the end of the reporting period.”.

(d) FUNCTION OF ANY UNIT OR OFFICE ESTABLISHED TO CONDUCT COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—Any unit or office established to conduct cost benefit analysis within the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall, as its sole function, carry out the considerations required by section 1022(b)(2)(A) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(2)(A)).

#### SEC. 7. CONSUMER ADVISORY BOARD REFORMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1014 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5494) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) QUALIFICATIONS.—In appointing the members of the Consumer Advisory Board, the Director shall—

“(A) seek to assemble a diverse and inclusive group of experts in consumer protection, financial services, community development, fair lending and civil rights, and consumer financial products or services and representatives of depository institutions that primarily serve underserved communities, and representatives of communities that have been significantly impacted by higher-priced mortgage loans, and seek representation of the interests of covered persons and consumers, without regard to party affiliation; and

“(B) ensure that at least ⅔ of the members represent the interests of consumers, including experts in consumer protection, fair lending, civil rights, and representatives of communities that have been significantly impacted by higher-priced mortgage loans and other products that resulted in consumer harm.

“(2) NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—The Director shall appoint not fewer than 25 members to the Consumer Advisory Board, and not fewer than 6 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the regional Federal Reserve Bank Presidents, on a rotating basis.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP RIGHTS AFTER CHARTER CHANGE.—Any change to the charter for the Consumer Advisory Board affecting the membership shall not preclude prior or current members from applying for consideration to serve on a reconstituted Consumer Advisory Board.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “meet from” and inserting “meet in person from”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The Bureau shall provide adequate notice to the members of the Consumer Advisory Board of the time and date of each meeting, and of any meeting cancellations.”

(b) INCLUSION OF THE DIRECTOR IN MEETINGS AND ACCESS TO BUREAU STAFF.—Section 1014 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5494) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) INCLUSION OF THE DIRECTOR IN MEETINGS AND ACCESS TO BUREAU STAFF.—With respect to each in person meeting of the Consumer Advisory Board—

“(1) the Director shall attend such meeting in person; and

“(2) the Director shall ensure that the members of the Consumer Advisory Board have an opportunity to meet and engage in person with all appropriate staff and office of the Bureau.”.

(c) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSUMER ADVISORY BOARD.—Notwithstanding any other law—

(1) any member of the Consumer Advisory Board of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on November 1, 2017, may continue to serve as a member of such advisory board until March 27, 2020, and may not be removed from such position without cause by the Director of the Bureau until such date; and

(2) any member of the Consumer Advisory Board of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on the date of enactment of this Act, may continue to serve as a member of such advisory board until March 27, 2020, and may not be removed from such position without cause by the Director of the Bureau until such date.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 1013 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5493), as amended by section 6(b)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) QUALIFICATIONS.—In appointing members of any advisory committee, other than the Consumer Advisory Board, the Director shall ensure that at least ⅓ of the members represent the interests of consumers, including experts in consumer protection, fair lending, civil rights, and representatives of communities that have been significantly impacted by higher-priced mortgage loans and other products that resulted in consumer harm.

“(2) SELECTION OF MEMBERS REPRESENTING MINORITY-OWNED AND WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES.—In appointing members of any advisory committee, the Director shall seek to promote diversity and inclusion in making appointments, including by appointing individuals who represent minority-owned and women-owned businesses.”.

#### SEC. 8. DISCRETIONARY SURPLUS FUNDS.

Section 7(a)(3)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 289(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “\$6,825,000,000” and inserting “\$6,797,000,000”.

#### SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall have 30 days to complete any operational changes to the Bureau required by this Act or an amendment made by this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 116-79. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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 amend-

ment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam 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 40, after line 8, insert the following:

#### SEC. 9. MODIFICATION OF THE EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2803) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to any depository institution described in section 303(3)(A) that has total assets, as of the most recent full fiscal year of the institution, of \$30,000,000 or less.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (o).

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 104 of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 115-174; 132 Stat. 1301) is amended by striking subsection (b).

#### SEC. 10. LIMITATION ON PROVIDING EXEMPTIONS FROM HMDA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 1027 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5517) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) LIMITATION ON PROVIDING EXEMPTIONS FROM HMDA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any provision of this title or the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, the Bureau may not provide any person with an exemption from complying with any reporting requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 if such exemption did not exist on the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

#### SEC. 11. LIMITATION ON MODIFYING HMDA DATA FIELDS.

Section 1027 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5517) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) LIMITATION ON MODIFYING HMDA DATA FIELDS.—Notwithstanding any provision of this title or the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, the Bureau may not eliminate, with respect to the reporting requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, any data fields that were required to be reported on the date of enactment of this subsection.”.

#### SEC. 12. MAINTAINING THE HMDA EXPLORER TOOL AND THE PUBLIC DATA PLATFORM API.

The Consumer Financial protection Bureau may not retire the HMDA Explorer tool or the Public Data Platform API.

Page 40, line 9, strike “SEC. 9” and insert “SEC. 13”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to restore and protect important provisions of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

More than four decades after Congress passed HMDA, the evidence continues to suggest that racial minorities, women, and some rural residents still face loan discrimination by mortgage lenders.

In fact, a recent report from the Center for Investigative Reporting found that modern-day redlining has occurred in 61 metropolitan areas around the country.

Unfortunately, however, last year Congress voted to roll back enhanced HMDA protections passed under the Dodd-Frank Act, exempting 85 percent of all banks and credit unions from reporting loan characteristics vital to ensuring lending fairness.

My amendment will reverse this shortsighted decision. It reinstates the requirement put in place by Dodd-Frank that any bank or credit union that makes more than 25 mortgage loans per year or 100 home equity lines of credit report detailed loan characteristics.

My amendment will establish additional safeguards to defend HMDA from further assault by the Trump administration and those who seek to destroy it by:

Prohibiting the CFPB from making further HMDA modifications to exempt additional institutions from complying with its reporting requirements;

Barring the CFPB from making further modifications to eliminate HMDA data fields that are otherwise required to be collected and reported; and

Preventing the CFPB from retiring its HMDA Explorer and the public data platform, both of which are critical to the public's ability to access loan level data and root out discrimination in their communities.

These protections are not just preventive measures but needed reforms. Just this month, the CFPB released proposals to further erode HMDA requirements.

The public's access to mortgage data is essential to promoting fair lending, homeownership, and stronger communities.

As the saying goes, sunlight is the best disinfectant. My amendment brings badly needed transparency to the home mortgage process, shining a light and helping us root out discrimination.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. FLETCHER). The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, this bill, this amendment, reinstates an older form of regulation of HMDA data. This is the data that is collected when you have a home mortgage. It is required data.

Under the old regulation, there were 48 pieces of data that had to be collected. Under the new regulation, it is 23. That is a modest change that was

agreed upon by a bipartisan vote of this House and the Senate and signed into law last Congress under S. 2155. A changed regulatory structure, still collecting the data.

The most important thing this bill does, however, is it subjects small credit unions and small banks to a higher level of regulation than contemplated under the new regulations and the new law.

We are rolling back to an older form, whereby community institutions, small banks, and small credit unions have been disproportionately disadvantaged in the mortgage marketplace. They have been given a higher regulatory burden, a higher cost structure, which means that they are out of the home mortgage game.

The net effect of this amendment is that you will have small credit unions and small banks not being able to participate as fully as under existing regulations in home mortgage making, and I think that is one of the deep flaws of this amendment.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chair, I am ready to close.

Madam Chair, more than 40 years after Congress first passed HMDA, the evidence continues to demonstrate that countless Americans still face loan discrimination by mortgage lenders.

Data is the tool that makes it possible to fight discrimination. My amendment puts us back on the right track by ensuring this information remains available.

Madam Chair, I urge Members to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. This rolls back to an older form of regulation, not a new, modern form of regulation.

We still collect very important data from mortgage makers, those that are actually in the mortgage marketplace. What we did was right-size our regulation so that small financial institutions like community banks and credit unions could be in the mortgage marketplace once again.

This amendment rolls back those reforms and hurts small community banks and hurts small credit unions in a way that this body, I don't think, wants to support.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. STEIL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. STEIL. Madam 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:

Strike section 2 and insert the following:

**SEC. 2. STUDY AND REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS AT MEETING ITS STATUTORILY MANDATED OBLIGATIONS.**

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study of—

(1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau in meeting the Bureau's statutorily mandated obligations;

(2) the prevalence of discriminatory practices in lending; and

(3) the workplace rights of Bureau staff since establishment of the Bureau.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1330

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has a duty to the American people.

Congress established the Bureau almost a decade ago to protect consumers from abuse and empower people to make good financial choices, regardless of who the President is. That is a very important responsibility. With that in mind, Chairwoman WATERS is right to call attention to the governance of the CFPB.

CFPB actions and interpretations can vary significantly from one administration to another, and because the CFPB is unaccountable, there isn't much Congress can do about it. In fact, the Bureau was built to be unaccountable and unresponsive, and this has given its Directors free rein to take actions that many of us do not support.

There are many ideas on both sides of the aisle on how best to reform the CFPB, and this is something Congress should consider soon.

Today, I have an amendment. My amendment sets aside the politically charged findings in the bill and takes us one step closer to transparency and accountability.

Some of these findings target former Acting Director Mick Mulvaney by name. One disparages Mulvaney by referencing a political article that includes a critical quote from an anonymous source. Another criticizes him for

rearranging the initials of the CFPB. Let me repeat that: Another criticizes him for rearranging the initials of the CFPB. Only in Washington.

My amendment strikes all of this unhelpful rhetoric and replaces it with a requirement that the Comptroller General conduct an independent study focused on three key questions: One, is the CFPB meeting its obligations efficiently and effectively? Two, how prevalent are discriminatory lending practices? Three, are the workplace rights of CFPB staff respected?

The Comptroller General's findings can then help to inform our continued efforts to oversee and reform the Bureau to make it work better for all Americans.

Protecting consumers, examining the prevalence of discrimination, and protecting workplace rights should not be controversial. Ensuring effectiveness and transparent governance should not be a source of partisan disagreement.

I understand that the chairwoman is unhappy with the way the CFPB is governed. So am I. Anyone who has read about the past abuses at this unaccountable agency should have concerns about the structure that enables this bad behavior to exist in the first place.

Today's amendment recognizes that Congress has a responsibility to ensure that the Bureau is fulfilling its mission, and that independent audit, not political rhetoric, is the best way to move toward this goal.

The American people deserve an unbiased look at what the Bureau does right and what it does wrong so we can find common ground on the best way to protect consumers.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, this is a terrible amendment, and I want to take my time to go through it so the American people can see how terrible this amendment is.

The gentleman is a fine gentleman and a good friend, and we work together. The amendment is what is terrible, not the gentleman. Let me tell you why.

This amendment would, number one, do away with the important findings on the failures of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under Mick Mulvaney that every American should know about. I am going to take a few minutes so the American people will know about them.

The amendment, which also removes the direction from Congress to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to reverse its recent anticonsumer activities, was rejected by all Democrats in our committee markup.

This amendment is trying to hide from public view how Acting Director

Mulvaney stopped payments from the Civil Penalty Fund to consumers who were harmed, tried to reduce the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's funding and staffing, politicized the work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau by making unusual efforts to fill the independent agency with political appointees, and reduced the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's enforcement actions by 75 percent compared to the average annual number of enforcement actions from the previous 3 years.

I mean, that is why it is terrible. That is why it is dangerous. Of particular concern, this amendment strikes a direction to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to resume exams for compliance with the Military Lending Act, for our veterans, to ensure that they are not ripped off by unscrupulous lenders. That practice is heavy.

We just passed a bill in committee to deal with mortgages that were churning, where predatory lenders were going in and churning, churning over and over again, making our veterans pay the same bill over and over again. That is what your amendment would take protections from.

In January of this year, the Consumer Office of Servicemember Affairs, our veterans, reported that servicemember complaints and requests for assistance have continued to increase over time. In fact, from 2016 to 2017, there was a 47 percent increase in complaints received from servicemembers.

Nevertheless, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under its current director, Ms. Kathy Kraninger, is ignoring its own legal counsel and refuses to supervise banks for MLA compliance.

During our March 7 hearing on the Bureau, veteran Jennifer Davis from the National Military Family Association stated: "We have become alarmed by the CFPB's decision to no longer supervise lenders for compliance with the MLA. Current leadership has expressed the opinion that the agency does not explicitly have the authority to do supervisory examinations to ensure MLA compliance. We disagree."

As Ms. Davis noted, Dodd-Frank grants the Bureau executive and administrative authority in implementation of consumer financial laws through rules, orders, guidance, interpretations, statements of policy, examinations, and enforcement actions. She has been joined by 38 military and veteran service organizations, a bipartisan coalition of 33 State attorneys general, as well as retired Army Colonel Paul Cantwell and the former head of the Office of Servicemember Affairs, in disagreeing with the Bureau's decision.

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

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining on my side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has authored a very good amendment. It is a constructive amendment in this legislative process to make a bad bill less bad.

It strikes the findings sections, not the legislation contained therein. It is the egregious findings and the personalities in the first 21 pages that the gentleman removes and says we should use the arm of Congress to look at those findings of fact and to get a report from the General Accountability Office on those matters raised in the findings section.

I urge my colleagues to support this very good amendment.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, I think the most important part here is that the findings are the political rhetoric that we are looking to remove. This town has far too much political rhetoric.

I am willing to work with my colleague to make this unaccountable entity accountable to Congress in the first place. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEIL. Madam 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment made in order by the rule, and I ask for its consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, beginning on line 9, strike "described under subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 1013" and insert "established under section 1013".

Page 30, after line 19, insert the following:

(3) REESTABLISHMENT OF MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.—The memoranda of understanding between the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Department of Education titled "Memorandum of Understanding Between the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and the U.S. Department of Education Concerning the Sharing of Information" (October 19, 2011) and "Memorandum of Understanding Concerning Supervisory and Oversight Cooperation and Related Information Sharing Between the U.S. Department of Education and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau" (January 9, 2014)—

(A) shall remain in effect and may not be terminated by any party to such memorandum; and

(B) may only be amended or revised if the parties to the memoranda determine that such amendment or revision would promote better interagency coordination to the benefit of consumers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, before the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, there was no Federal agency dedicated to protecting consumers from predatory and abusive practices, so I am grateful to my chair for bringing this issue before us.

I am not exactly sure why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been so resistant to protecting consumers and to restoring the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to its original intent.

My amendment would restore the relationship between the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Department of Education. Specifically, it would reestablish an interagency agreement concerning the sharing of student borrower complaints and allow for cooperation in the supervision and oversight of student loan servicers.

It is critical that the Department of Education work with the CFPB on student loan oversight. Currently, the Department of Education is refusing to share information about loan servicers and student borrower complaints, which is making it more difficult for the CFPB to conduct its investigations into the lenders' bad behavior and deceptive practices.

In fact, last Thursday, it was reported that the Director of the CFPB, in response to Senator WARREN's inquiry, stated that Secretary DeVos and the Department of Education were blocking efforts to conduct proper oversight on the student loan industry.

Because of the stance the Department of Education has taken, many student loan servicers and lenders are not complying with CFPB's request for information as well. These companies that manage student loans are refusing to share information that the CFPB needs to perform proper oversight. This is unacceptable.

The national student loan debt has reached crisis levels. The American people are getting crushed by more than \$1.5 trillion in student debt. Moreover, we have seen countless lawsuits allege that widespread wrongdoing by student loan companies is costing some borrowers thousands of dollars.

This critical amendment would put borrowers back at the center of the Bureau's consumer protection work.

Our constituents have elected us to look out for their best interests, to protect them from harmful policies, and to provide them recourse when they get into difficult situations. Dis-

mantling, undermining, and weakening the CFPB is not in our constituents' best interests.

I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her leadership in restoring the CFPB to its original intent.

Let's do the right thing for the American people. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to help student borrowers and to support H.R. 1500.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for raising this issue of student loans. It is a very important issue for a whole generation of Americans.

But let's rewind and understand why we are in the position we are in with student loans. In 2009 and 2010, there was a Democratic majority in the House and the Senate that, in order to pass ObamaCare, they needed pay-fors to pass the Affordable Care and Patient Protection Act, the formal name of what we commonly call ObamaCare.

□ 1345

One of the major pay-fors was the nationalization of student lending. So now we have a generation of American students that have a crushing debt burden because of a government program. Ninety percent of student loans are done through the Federal Government.

So let's get to the fundamentals of this reform, so that consumers can have choice, students can have choice.

This amendment doesn't do that.

The memorandum of understanding between the CFPB and the U.S. Department of Education outlines the parameters to share student loan information. The Department of Education was clear in its letter terminating the memorandum of understanding, stating:

It takes exception to the CFPB unilaterally expanding its oversight role to include the Department's contracted Federal student loan servicers. The Department has full oversight responsibility for Federal student loans under Federal law.

The Department letter also expressed concern that:

CFPB's intervention in this area adds confusion to borrowers who now hear conflicting guidance related to Title IV of student loan services for which the Department is responsible.

So the memorandum of understanding was terminated because the two separate departments, the CFPB and the Department of Education, were sending information to students who were trying to make payments, some were trying to catch up on payments, and they are getting two different pieces of guidance.

So to reinstate this provides more confusion for the very people that are

being crushed by a generation of debt. So it is a deeply problematic amendment, not because it has an ill intent.

The very issue that we are trying to confront here is a very real one to these students, to their families, and to the lost prosperity and economic opportunities that they are experiencing because of the structure of this debt load and because of this Federalized approach to student lending.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments from my colleague from North Carolina.

But we want to make sure that private loan services who collect payments, or those who collect payments from students, are doing their job.

Now, yes, students want choices. I taught for 40 years on the campus of Bennett College. I know the difficulty that students have, and I know that they leave college with a lot of debt, but we should not hold them hostage. They are asking for a choice to resolve the problems, and they need someone there who will speak for them.

That is what this bill will do. That is what was done before, and we need to restore that kind of confidence back into these students so that they know that they can get some help when they need it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, let me just say this: This is a good amendment. This is a great bill. It is an opportunity for us to restore some confidence and integrity into this process.

We should not hold our students hostage and penalize them because of something that the Congressman said the government has done.

Madam Chair, we have an opportunity to fix this, and I would certainly encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, let me state this clearly. Dodd-Frank conferred authority over private student lending to the CFPB. It did not grant the CFPB a role in Federal student lending that is overseen by the Department of Education.

So this amendment is a counterpoint to what is existing law. The memorandum of understanding was terminated for good reason.

This amendment is nothing more than an attempt to undo another Federal agency's action without understanding the context in which it was terminated.

I think the fundamental issue here is consumer choice, student choice. We lack that currently.



When 90 percent of student lending is run by the Federal Government, we have a problem. That is a nationalized set of lending.

With more consumer choice, with better technology, with real innovation, we can give students better opportunities and better choices. Those things are happening in the private sector, but in a limited way, because the Federal Government is so deeply involved in student lending.

Let's fix that issue of student lending with good reforms, with proper innovation, with more choices.

Madam Chair, this amendment does not achieve those things, sadly, and I would ask my colleagues to vote "no."

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LAWSON OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment on the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 40, after line 8, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON FAIR LENDING INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.**

Section 1016 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) REPORT ON FAIR LENDING INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—The Director shall issue a monthly report to Congress containing—

"(1) the number of investigations opened and closed by the Bureau relating to potential fair lending violations;

"(2) how many fair lending enforcement actions have been taken or referred;

"(3) an analysis of consumer complaints relating to potential fair lending violations; and

"(4) statistics on how many staff of the Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity are dedicated to fair lending supervision and enforcement issues."

Page 40, line 9, strike "SEC. 9" and insert "SEC. 10".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise to support the Consumers First Act and my amendment that would provide transparency in the number of fair lending cases that are opened and closed by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

This Bureau was created under Dodd-Frank to provide consumer protection from unfair lending practices. These individuals include our Nation's vet-

erans, students, those who have mortgages, and individuals with auto loans, which is very prevalent.

Since the creation of the CFPB, it has helped over 31 million harmed consumers with over \$12 billion in relief. That is pretty substantial.

In addition, the CFPB has received and taken action on nearly 1 million complaints.

Today, the CFPB's ability to continue protecting our Nation's borrowers has been severely limited by the Trump administration. The administration has weakened the supervision and enforcement of fair lending, blocked payday loan cases, dismantled protections for servicemembers, and has reduced transparency and accountability.

The Consumers First Act fights back.

The bill, along with the amendment, specifically requires transparency in fair lending investigations, requires interagency cooperation, and demands diversity and inclusion efforts.

My home State of Florida has one of the highest rates of consumer complaints in the Nation. Some of it might be due to the elderly population that we have or the high number of just regular citizens who need protection.

What would these consumers do without the CFPB? What would be their recourse for Federal action?

Madam Chair, it is time that we put consumers first. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to support the underlying bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I believe this amendment will divert important resources away from pursuing fair lending violations. I know that is not my colleague's intent.

We currently have an annual report requirement under this very provision. I do not think a monthly report would give added clarity to Members of Congress.

Moreover, when it comes to Federal regulatory agencies under the jurisdiction of the Financial Services Committee, I know of no other monthly reporting requirement we impose upon regulators, and so this would be inconsistent with other pieces of financial regulation and the law that we currently have.

If Congress wants to control more of how the CFPB is using its resources, we should bring them under the annual appropriations process. That is a fundamental reform which is not included in the underlying bill.

Madam Chair, I would say that while my colleague has a very important issue he is raising here and trying to clarify on the actions of the CFPB and ensuring that fair lending is enforced reasonably, I concur with him that that is an important and good thing,

but a monthly reporting requirement will provide no additional clarity for us as public policymakers.

Madam Chair, I stand in opposition to the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Chair, how many minutes do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Chair, I would say to the distinguished member from North Carolina, who I have enjoyed working with, during my tenure in Florida, especially in the Florida legislature, one of the biggest complaints was for protection for the consumers.

I spent my career there fighting on their behalf, for the voiceless who did not have a voice, and I continue with this fight here, because I know the importance of it.

Madam Chair, I can tell the gentleman, if I walked out of here today and just walked down the street and asked an average person what was more important to them, they would say the consumer protection that they feel that they don't really have.

This is the most important legislation that I have seen since I have been in Congress, because it goes straight to the people who need it the most, our veterans, our students, regular consumers, just the average people.

Big banks and institutions have a lot of protection, but the average person does not have this protection.

Madam Chair, I can guarantee my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if they vote for this protection, it will be in the same vein of when our great President Lincoln said that: "The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

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

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

Madam Chair, in closing, I want to commend the author of this amendment, who is using this opportunity to highlight his support of fair lending enforcement by the CFPB. I commend him for that. I commend my colleague for that. I believe he is a thoughtful legislator.

I reluctantly oppose this amendment, given the fact that we have already provided in law and regulation an annual report of this same data, and I believe that resources would be better spent on protecting consumers directly around fair lending violations rather than reporting on a monthly basis what they do on an annual basis.

Madam Chair, while I oppose this bill, I certainly commend my colleague for his passion, his care for consumer protection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON).



The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam 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 40, after line 8, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. DEBT COLLECTION.**

(a) REPORT ON DEBT COLLECTION COMPLAINTS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—Section 1016 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) REPORT ON DEBT COLLECTION COMPLAINTS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—The Director shall issue a quarterly report to Congress containing—

“(1) an analysis of the consumer complaints received by the Bureau with respect to debt collection, including a State-by-State breakdown of such complaints; and

“(2) a list of enforcement actions taken against debt collectors during the previous 12 months.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON DEBT COLLECTION RULES.—Section 1022 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) LIMITATION ON DEBT COLLECTION RULES.—The Director may not issue any rule with respect to debt collection that allows a debt collector to send unlimited email and text messages to a consumer.”.

Page 40, line 9, strike “SEC. 9” and insert “SEC. 10”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1500 and in support of the Consumers First Act.

I also want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her leadership and her stewardship in this endeavor.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill, which will return the Consumer Bureau to its intended role as a nonpartisan consumer watchdog that protects the interests of American taxpayers, not those of special interests.

In 2017, the Urban Institute found that 71 million Americans had a debt in collection on their credit report. Meanwhile, collectors estimate they contact consumers more than a billion times a year—a billion.

During the 2008 financial crisis, people lost homes, jobs, and hard-earned wealth. This crisis was the prime example of what can happen when nobody is looking out for the consumers who are left to navigate a financial system built to confuse, mystify, and capitalize on the most vulnerable.

In response, Democrats created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an agency with the sole mission of protecting consumers and holding lenders accountable when they put profits over people.

In my home State of Massachusetts, 46 percent of those living in communities of color have debt in collections compared to only 18 percent of residents in predominantly White areas.

We know that debt collectors engage in some of the most aggressive tactics: harassing, berating, and even falsely threatening legal action against vulnerable consumers.

My amendment would require the Director of the Consumer Bureau to issue quarterly reports to Congress, including an analysis of complaints submitted by consumers. The Consumer Bureau's complaint database has been a crucial tool to monitor harmful industry trends and agency enforcement efforts in defense of consumers.

Since the beginning of this administration, more than 62,000 consumers submitted complaints on harmful and unfair debt collection practices. The Consumer Bureau, under Director Mulvaney and now Director Kraninger's failed leadership, has returned zero—zero—relief to harmed consumers.

My amendment will require the Director to report on the various enforcement actions taken against these debt collectors because we cannot afford to go back to the days in which consumers were left to fend for themselves in a financial industry that was stacked against them.

Information is power. The more information we have, the more power we have to protect consumers from harassment.

Recently, the Consumer Bureau released a proposed debt collection rule filled with carveouts and loopholes that would allow debt collectors to more aggressively target and harass consumers through emails and text messages.

My amendment would prohibit the Director from issuing further rules that would essentially open the floodgates and allow collectors to bombard consumers.

I urge my colleagues to stand with consumers and to support my amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. I am opposed to the amendment.

I would ask the amendment's author, if I am reading this correctly, that on a quarterly basis they will disclose the previous 12 months' action.

Am I reading the legislative text?

Ms. PRESSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for clarifying.

Madam Chair, I would say that having a quarterly requirement for an an-

nual report doesn't seem like the right approach. We currently have an annual report, so what this amendment does is simply say, on a quarterly basis, they must provide an annual report rather than have an actual annual report annually. So this is really about micro-managing the Bureau.

The Bureau currently reports on an annual basis, as the Congresswoman from Massachusetts outlined. Moreover, it not only changes that, it also changes what is currently in the middle of a 90-day public comment period, which is the regulations put forward on May 7 by the Bureau on fair debt collection practices.

What this amendment does is simply say that, for debt collection purposes, you can't text or email a consumer. That is what this amendment does. That is not modern. That is not the nature of how we communicate with our smartphones in today's environment.

What this amendment would do is drive up the cost of healthcare, of collecting on student loans. By not being able to communicate with consumers in a modern way, they will not have the follow-up necessary so that consumers will have some knowledge that perhaps they owe money that they didn't otherwise know about.

And simply saying snail mail is the way to go does not seem like what this amendment should be about nor what we should be about as a Congress. We should be using all elements of technology to make sure that our financial institutions, our government can actually communicate with people in the way that they see fit. This amendment limits that.

I think this amendment is unproductive. The public should have the right to opine on the proposal put forward by the CFPB, and the public should also have the right to be communicated with by their financial service providers in a way that they see fit.

So, with that, I do ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I just think it is important to remind my colleague across the aisle that consumers are being harassed aggressively, and many of them did not even incur the debt for which they are being harassed. So we need to close these loopholes.

The current rule is rife with loopholes and carveouts and will open the floodgates for debt collectors to further bombard consumers. My amendment will ensure that the Consumer Bureau continues to put consumers first and protects them from relentless harassment. We simply want this data to be accessible on a quarterly basis because it will make it easier.

The Consumer Bureau is an independent agency, and it needs to continue to operate as such. Under Dodd-

Frank, the Director is required to report to Congress annually, and the GAO office is required to annually audit the agency's finances. The efforts of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are intended to weaken this agency.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, again, this is ultimately about honoring the very mission of the Bureau, and that is to put consumers first.

I support H.R. 1500, and I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment, which will be a further effort to protect consumers and to guard against the harassment that so many Americans are experiencing every day.

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

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to say to the author of this legislation, I understand your intention. We have a rule that is out for comment right now to get the public feedback on this.

Moreover, I would say, under existing law, harassment by debt collectors is not permitted, period, under current law. What is prevented, though, is somebody who is trying to collect debts from actually texting someone. That is a problem.

I don't think that is the intention of this amendment, but that is the net effect, because the regulations put forward say that you can text, you can email, something that the Debt Collection Act, written before email, written before text messaging, did not contemplate. We are updating this so that people can be communicated with in a modern way.

There is nothing more annoying than finding on your voice mail some random voice mail from somebody you have never heard of, and you are supposed to call this random person and provide them information. How about a text, right?

When I got a text from my pharmacy that said, "Do you want to reorder your prescription?" and I texted back, "Yes," that saved me a phone call. I liked it.

When talking about student debt, if somebody doesn't even know that they have missed a payment and the debt collector calls and they have got a full voice mail, they may never know that they missed a payment. If they got a text or if they got an email, that may be the way that they actually want to be communicated with.

What we are talking about is innovation; what we are talking about is modern communication; and what we are talking about is reasonable regulation to ensure that consumers, especially students, are able to be communicated with in the way that they seek and the way that they like.

This amendment is premature because there is notice and comment out

under the rule that this seeks to undo, and this amendment is unproductive because it limits the rights of individuals to be communicated with in the way that they seek. That is what I would say.

To Members of Congress, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I would also say that they are going back to an old system. If they don't want modernization under the current rule so that people can be communicated with in the way that they seek, I would tell Members of Congress to not text or email their constituents but only mail them through the U.S. Postal Service.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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 27, line 5, strike "and" and insert a period.

Page 27, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 28, line 13.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, this amendment permanently subjects funding for the CFPB to congressional appropriation and authorizes funding for fiscal year 2020 at the fiscal year 2019 level.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is currently funded by the Federal Reserve System, based upon a formula. Congress has never been able to fully determine the funding level for the CFPB, limiting congressional oversight and the American taxpayers' right to have a voice in these activities.

As Acting Director Mick Mulvaney stated in his quarterly funding request to Chairman Jerome Powell of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors: "By design, this funding mechanism denies the American people their rightful control over how the Bureau spends their money. This undermines the Bureau's legitimacy. The Bureau should be funded through congressional appropriations. However, I am bound to execute the law as written."

If Democrats do not like the actions of the CFPB Director, they should support returning control to the Congress, to the United States House of Representatives, to the people's House, through the appropriations process, as

was envisioned by the Founders in the Constitution. This amendment simply returns congressional oversight by bringing funding for the CFPB under our discretionary appropriations process.

Madam Chair, I urge all Members to support this important and common-sense reform, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to amendment No. 6.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, this amendment would take the widely successful consumer complaint database dark, hiding from the public how consumers report personally being harmed by financial institutions.

The Dodd-Frank Act required the CFPB to establish a consumer complaint database to provide consumers with the opportunity to report complaints about financial products and services.

A public database empowers consumers to seek redress when harmed and benefits the public by providing firsthand stories to help other consumers to avoid similar harms.

A public database also promotes market discipline and encourages financial firms to treat their consumers fairly. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has received over 1.5 million consumer submissions, with a 97 percent response rate by financial firms to the consumer complaints.

□ 1415

This means that the American people know, need, and use this function. Taking this away from the public only harms hardworking people in need of help and benefits the bad actors.

Through its research, education, market monitoring, and the much-used consumer complaint database, the CFPB has been able to directly address problems in the market and issues that directly harm hardworking families. This is especially useful for the millions of consumers who, unfortunately, do not have the financial means, time, or access to the judicial court system.

Mandating that the consumer complaint database remain transparent and publicly accessible is an important aspect of this bill and will promote better conduct from providers of financial services across this country. Thus, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment to H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Chair, this amendment strikes a section of the bill requiring

public availability of all consumer complaints, obviously a CFPB web page. A provision of the bill requires that all consumer complaints be made available on a public CFPB website. While it sounds like an attempt at transparency, I am concerned about how it will affect the entities against which the complaints are filed.

We had a similar provision that was included back in the stimulus bill, the HITECH Act in ARRA in 2009, resulting in the loss of consumer confidence in healthcare entities because there was no reporting required on remedial action. That is, once you got on the list, you could never get off the list.

The language of this bill requires disclosure of complaints, but there is no information on which complaints must be posted and whether they can be removed. Will entities be publicly held as guilty before an investigation is conducted? Will there be a way to indicate that remedial action has occurred?

Until these questions are clarified, we must not subject entities to the immediate disclosure of consumer complaints.

This amendment strikes this provision so that we may thoroughly discuss these issues before submitting them to become law.

Madam Chair, again, I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I would like to reiterate my strong opposition to this amendment.

Congress must ensure that consumer complaints to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau are available to the public to hold companies accountable to the American people for their actions or lack of actions.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment to H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Madam 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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:

Redesignate section 9 as section 10.

Insert after section 8 the following:

**SEC. 9 BRINGING THE AGENCY INTO THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the heading of such subsection to read as follows: “Budget, Financial Management, And Audit.—”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

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

(D) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) of paragraph (1), as so redesignated;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau for fiscal year 2020 an amount equal to the aggregate amount of funds transferred by the Board of Governors to the Bureau during fiscal year 2019.”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Madam Chair, this amendment permanently subjects the funding of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to congressional appropriation and authorizes funding for fiscal year 2020 at the fiscal year 2019 level.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is currently funded through the Federal Reserve System based on a formula. Congress has never been able to fully determine the fund level for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, limiting congressional oversight and the American taxpayers’ right to have a voice in these activities. Acting Director Mick Mulvaney so stated during his quarterly funding request to Chairman Jerome Powell of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

If the Democrats do not like the actions of the Director of the CFPB, they should support returning control to Congress, to the people’s House, through the appropriations process.

This amendment simply returns congressional oversight by bringing funding for the CFPB under our discretionary appropriations process.

Madam Chair, I urge all Members to support this commonsense reform, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment because it seeks to limit the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau by using the appropri-

tions process to politicize and defund the agency.

All the bank regulators are independently funded. In addition to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Reserve, the OCC, the FDIC, and the NCUA are all funded outside of the appropriations process. In fact, so is the FHFA, the FSOC, and OFR.

Congress provided the regulators with independence from the executive branch and the appropriations process to ensure that financial regulators focused on protecting the financial system from harm.

However, ever since it was created, Republicans have focused on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s funding because, more than any other agency, it has helped level the playing field between Wall Street on one side and families, communities of color, older Americans, servicemembers, and students on the other.

Under the guise of the appropriations process, Republicans are seeking to do by amendment what they were unable to do for the 8 years they were in power, eliminate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau entirely.

To that end, Mulvaney’s first request for funds to be transferred from the Federal Reserve to fund the CFPB’s operations was zero. He later asked Congress to turn the CFPB, which he previously called a “sick, sad” joke of an agency, into an appropriated one.

In addition, Republicans often point to the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is subject to annual appropriations, as an example we should follow. What they seem to forget is that during Trump’s 35-day shutdown, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau remained open while the SEC was effectively shuttered.

Advocacy groups like Americans for Financial Reform also point out that “big banks would be able to use the politically charged appropriations process to deny funding for rule-writing or enforcement actions that Wall Street particularly dislikes. They could simply starve the agency of the basic funds it needs to do its job or threaten to do so in order to intimidate the agency out of taking actions to curb abuses by powerful companies.”

The difference with Mulvaney and the Trump administration is that they have purposely sought to ignore or disregard the law and the independence Congress tried to create. Mulvaney, who reports directly to Trump, clearly ignored the law when he directed the agency to stop supervising banks for violations of the Military Lending Act.

Nevertheless, I am not surprised that Republicans’ efforts to reform the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau involve trying to starve the agency of funding.

Madam Chair, Democrats want to ensure the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau can do and is doing its jobs and puts consumers first. This amendment does exactly the opposite, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Director Mulvaney in his quarterly funding request to Jerome Powell of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors: "By design, this funding mechanism denies the American people their rightful control over how the Bureau spends their money, which this undermines the Bureau's legitimacy. The Bureau should be funded through congressional appropriations. However, I am bound to execute the law as written."

It says pretty clearly in the Constitution that no money may be drawn from the Treasury except as an appropriation by the United States Congress.

Most people do not accuse us of underspending when it comes to the appropriations process, so I fail to see that as a valid argument.

Look, if you don't like the actions of the Director of the CFPB, support returning the funding to the Congress, support returning control to the Congress so you will have the control that you seek.

Madam Chair, I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I would like to reiterate my strong opposition to this amendment.

Today, the House is trying to return the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to its mission of putting consumers first. This amendment, instead, is meant to slow down and ultimately starve the agency by using the appropriations process.

Madam Chair, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle have tried everything they could try to dismantle the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. I think it is odd that they would spend their time opposing what is good for consumers and, yet, embracing the very institutions that caused us to have a recession in 2008 and to harm the American people.

Madam Chair, I ask that everyone oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak on behalf of Dr. BURGESS' Amendment to H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) has two primary flaws. First, Congress does not oversee the agency, and a sole director determines its priorities. Second, instead of securing funding through the Congressional appropriations process, the CFPB receives money from the Federal Reserve. This funding method exempts it from budgetary limitations and is a prime candidate for the irresponsible use of tax dollars.

These practices do not serve the American people, those that this agency was designed to protect. Because of this current lack of oversight and accountability, the agency is vulnerable to political whims. An agency this powerful should have Congressional oversight.

Dr. BURGESS' amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor, would help to right these

wrongs. It would subject the CFPB to the Congressional appropriations process, just like other federal agencies of similar scope and size. This is not a partisan amendment: The simple change would increase resistance to political impulses and accountability to the American people.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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 Texas will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. COHEN. Madam 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:

Redesignate section 9 as section 10.

Insert after section 8 the following:

#### SEC. 9. CREDIT SCORES INCLUDED IN FREE ANNUAL DISCLOSURES.

Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end and inserting a period;

(B) by striking "except that—" and all that follows through "(A) if the" and inserting "except that if the"; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B);

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

"(7) If the consumer reporting agency is a consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis as described in section 603(p), each such agency shall disclose a current credit score generated using the scoring algorithm, formula, model, program, or mechanism that is most frequently used to generate credit scores sold to creditors, subject to regulations of the Bureau, along with any information in the consumer's file at the time of the request concerning credit scores or any other risk scores or other predictors relating to the consumer, if such request is made in connection with a free annual disclosure made pursuant to section 612(a)."

"(8) Such other consumer information as the Bureau considers appropriate with respect to consumer financial education, including the information required by subsection (f)(1), information describing the credit score of the consumer with respect to a range of possible credit scores, and the general factors contributing to the credit scores of consumers.";

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "a consumer reporting agency" and all that follows through "shall include—" and inserting "or a risk score, a consumer reporting agency shall supply to the consumer—" ; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) any credit score or risk score in the file of the consumer at the consumer reporting agency;" ;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) CREDIT SCORE.—The term 'credit score' means a numerical value or a categorization derived from a statistical tool or modeling system used by a person who makes or arranges a loan to predict the likelihood of certain credit behaviors, including default."

"(B) RISK SCORE.—The term 'risk score' means a numerical value or a categorization derived from a statistical tool or modeling system based upon information from a consumer report for the purpose of predicting the likelihood of certain behaviors or outcomes, and includes scores used for the underwriting of insurance." ;

(C) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

"(6) MAINTENANCE OF CREDIT SCORES.—All consumer reporting agencies shall maintain in the consumer's file credit scores or any other risk scores or other predictors relating to the consumer for a period of not less than 1 year beginning on the date on which such information is generated." ;

(D) by striking paragraph (7) and redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(E) in paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by inserting before the period at the end the following: " , except that a consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall provide a credit score without charge to the consumer if the consumer is requesting the score in connection with a free annual disclosure made pursuant to section 612(a)." ;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2½ minutes. The coauthor of this amendment is Mrs. BEATTY from Ohio.

Madam Chair, this amendment will allow consumers to obtain free access to their credit scores. It directs the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to require that consumer reporting agencies disclose free credit scores to consumers who make that request.

Federal law currently allows consumers to obtain one credit report per year from each of the major credit bureaus that monitor consumer credit information. These free reports include all the current data on which a credit score would be based but don't include the credit score itself.

For consumers, this is kind of like trying to figure out how well their favorite baseball team is doing based on newly created analytics for the modern sports fan and not for us who know just home runs, ERA, and strikeouts. If not for the current win-loss record, would people be able to know how their team is doing.

Good credit scores mean better interest rates on mortgages, bank loans, and credit cards; smaller deposits for rent and utilities; and even lower insurance premiums.

As important as credit scores are, they are still a mystery to most Americans. While most understand the fundamentals, such as the importance of

paying bills on time, there is a lot of uncertainty about how the credit score is actually determined.

Many Americans don't know, for example, that maxing out your credit card can be about as bad as making a late payment. Many people also wrongly believe their credit scores reflect their income, age, marital status, education, or even ethnicity.

A large majority of Americans are unable to define a good credit score—700—and many don't know that small changes in behavior could have a large impact on the interest rates that they will pay on loans.

With that in mind, this amendment directs the CFPB to determine if agencies should also disclose other consumer information appropriate with respect to consumer financial education.

□ 1430

People with poor or mediocre credit scores pay for them with higher interest rates, bigger security deposits, and higher insurance premiums.

The one number that can make or break someone's financial future more than salary is their credit score. I believe consumers have a right to obtain their credit score for free from the same source that supplies it to other entities.

I would like to acknowledge my former staffer, Michael Fulton, now an executive with the Memphis International Airport, who worked on the original bill, the Fair Access to Credit Scores Act, which I introduced 9 years ago in the 111th Congress.

I look forward to working more on this important issue with Chairwoman WATERS and my partner on this amendment, Congresswoman BEATTY from Ohio.

I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Chair, the inclusion of credit scores on the free annual credit report is an issue that my colleague from Tennessee and I have worked on for several Congresses. Under current law, all consumers are entitled to a free annual report from the three credit reporting agencies. However, despite providing consumers with all of the information that makes up their credit scores, the free annual report does not actually include a credit score. That needs to change. Adoption of this amendment would do just that.

I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for working with us.

I also want to share that financial literacy is a lifelong journey, and as co-chair of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, I believe that knowledge of one's own credit score is essential. There are few three-digit numbers as important to consumers as their credit score. Despite the importance, nearly 60 percent of U.S. adults are unaware of what their score is.

Whether applying for a home or an auto loan, applying for a line of credit

or a credit card, or even applying for a job, undoubtedly, a credit score plays an integral role in the everyday financial lives of all Americans. I am asking and urging my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment that would place, I believe, an unnecessary burden on credit bureaus with no benefits to consumers.

Currently, consumers have access to free credit scores through the [annualcreditreport.com](http://annualcreditreport.com) website run by the big three credit reporting agencies, or CRAs. On this website, consumers can get three separate credit scores, one at each of these three CRAs, for free. This amendment will use the CFPB to require that the CRAs provide an additional credit score to consumers. That is right, a fourth credit score.

Specifically, the amendment requires CRAs to use the credit score that is most frequently used. What the legislation fails to mention is that the most frequently used score is a FICO score. FICO scores are not free.

This amendment requires that the credit bureaus, all private companies, purchase credit scores from FICO, another private company; and in doing so, it is mandating the transfer of potentially hundreds of millions of dollars from one company to another company.

One has to ask oneself, why is this designed to punish these three CRAs or to create a massive payday for FICO? This is the USA, not USSR, not China, and not Venezuela. The government has no right to force a private company to hand millions of dollars to another private company simply because the government official prefers one product over another.

In addition, the chairwoman has introduced legislation to reform the CRA and has yet to bring a bill up before the committee. I would imagine this amendment that deals with credit scores, not consumer protection, is better suited to be debated under regular order in our committee than thrown onto a bill that seeks to amend CFPB governance.

In short, this amendment has the government picking winners and losers, provides little or no benefit to consumers, is irrelevant to the subject of this bill, and should be soundly defeated.

This sets a horrible precedent, Madam Chairwoman. We are dictating one private company to pay another private company for a service. When do we ever do that? That is amazing precedent to set. How can we do this?

We are not a dictatorial government here. We allow the winners and losers to be chosen by the people through economic freedom. We don't dictate who

buys a product from here and who buys a product from there. That is what the people are allowed to do on their own, and that is what makes our country so great is economic freedom to be able to do that: pick and choose between what companies provide what services and which ones they want to pay for. Instead of dictating how one company should pay another, we should be allowing the freedom for them to choose.

Again, this amendment is about picking winners and losers. It provides no benefit to consumers and should be soundly defeated.

Madam Chair, is my understanding correct that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) has no time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chairwoman, in the minute that I have, I can't read the bill to the gentleman, but what the gentleman talked about is not the bill. It might be something somewhere up in the stratosphere, but this has nothing to do with picking one company, or Venezuela, or some other communist country. This has to do with giving consumers the fair opportunity to see what their credit score is.

That is America. That is fairness. That is justice.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chairwoman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

There is landmark legislation in the 1990s that required a free credit report. The underlying components of a free credit report are given directly by the agencies to the people. What this would require is the CFPB to go purchase the FICO, or take the FICO score, which is derived from the underlying credit reports.

The underlying credit reports are much more meaningful in terms of the value they provide to consumers. The flaws that they have in them, consumers can remedy.

We currently have existing law that does the right thing here. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this, while a thoughtful idea, a bad idea in how it is constructed.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has the right to close.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Chairwoman, this is a good bill. I appreciate the idea of thoughtful. It is thoughtful and it is good. And maybe it distinguishes the parties. One party is looking out for consumers to have an opportunity to get a chance to see their score and

have a fair chance in the American economic system, to participate, and the other doesn't care.

Madam Chairwoman, I ask that we pass the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY), the ranking member.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, it is insulting to hear a colleague say that the other party does not care about the consumer. That is absolutely wrong. It is not becoming to the House, and it is not becoming to the debate on this House floor.

We care about consumers; we all do. It is about how we take care of them and how we defend them.

This is a bad amendment, badly constructed. We already have a free credit report. We don't need the CFPB to get between consumers and their free credit report. This amendment does that, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 116–79.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam 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:

On page 33, insert after line 15 the following:

(5) REPORT ON RISKS TO YOUNG CONSUMERS AND STUDENT BORROWERS.—Not less than once annually, the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman shall issue a report to Congress containing an analysis of complaints submitted to the Bureau by young consumers and student borrowers during the previous year and offering an independent evaluation of risks to young consumers and student borrowers posed by policies and practices in the marketplace for consumer financial products and services.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act.

I thank Chairwoman WATERS and my colleagues for their leadership in restoring essential functions of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which this administration so recklessly rolled back.

During my years of work as a consumer protection attorney, I learned firsthand how strong consumer protection laws help to keep Americans financially secure. This administration's efforts to weaken the CFPB have harmed millions of people across the

country, including young consumers and student borrowers.

I commend my colleagues for including in the original bill the restoration of the CFPB's Office of Students and Young Consumers, which this administration closed last year. Shutting down this office diminished the CFPB's mission and weakened its enforcement capabilities.

Before its closure, this office returned more than \$750 million to students and student loan borrowers through actions against unscrupulous student loan servicers. They also helped more than 60,000 borrowers who submitted complaints about the student loan industry to the CFPB.

Notably, in January of 2017, the CFPB and the Office of Students and Young Consumers stood up to the Nation's largest student loan servicer, Navient, for misallocating payments and improperly steering borrowers away from income-based repayment plans.

The amendment I am offering today with my colleague, Congressman HARLEY ROUDA, would build on this office's critical role in protecting young consumer students and student loan borrowers. This amendment would require the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman of the newly restored Office of Students and Young Consumers to issue an annual report to Congress on risks to young consumers and student borrowers.

Specifically, this report would analyze complaints that were submitted to the CFPB in the previous year by young consumers and student borrowers and offer an independent evaluation of the risks to this population as a result of policies and practices in the consumer financial products and services marketplace. This report will help us understand the risks that our young consumers and borrowers face, and it will help inform the work of Congress on how to best fight back against those who seek to prey on our Nation's young people.

I ask my colleagues to support this important amendment that will help students, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chairwoman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, this is a reasonable amendment that highlights the issues facing young borrowers.

As I said in previous amendment debate, in 2009 and 2010, the student loan industry was nationalized. Ninety percent of student loans are government loans. It is the government that is putting and saddling a generation of students in unsustainable debt. That is deeply problematic.

As a result of the pay-for of the ACA and as a result of the pay-for under

ObamaCare, that industry is now 90 percent government. That is problematic.

This amendment doesn't deal with the substance of that, though it does deal with the risk factors associated with young consumers and student borrowers. I think it is important that we highlight the needs of young borrowers, the needs of students, and this amendment will provide that type of data on an annual basis. I think it is a good amendment.

I appreciate the author for her willingness to engage in this debate, but also highlighting the need for us to think more thoughtfully here in Congress, think more deeply around financial literacy.

We passed a bipartisan resolution a month ago that highlighted the National Endowment for Financial Education and the needs of financial literacy, the basic understanding of interest rates, the time value of money, and basic fundamentals of financial literacy that young people need to be aware of and the population needs to be aware of more generally. This amendment gets to that subject matter that is a bipartisan concern and is a bipartisan approach to that bipartisan concern.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the Congresswoman for offering it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for his bipartisan support. This is an issue that we all hear about from our constituents.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I know that we are working hard on affordable higher education; but, in the meantime, we need to make sure that we are aware of the problems that so many student loan borrowers have. This amendment will help us get the information through a report, and I appreciate that this will help us inform our approach here in Congress, as well as get a better understanding of the practices of student loan services.

□ 1445

Again, I thank the gentleman for his bipartisan support, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her support of the amendment, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I want to close by reminding Congress and reminding my colleagues that in 2009 and 2010 the Democrat House, Democrat Senate, and Democrat President nationalized the student lending industry. Ninety percent of student loans last year were done by the government. Only 10 percent were done by the private sector.

That is deeply problematic. It is government that is saddling a generation of students with debt that is unsustainable for them. The lost economic potential as a result of that is



deeply problematic for our Nation and for the individuals who are affected here.

To highlight the risk factors facing young consumers and student borrowers is the right thing. For our Congress to have that proper data is important, but do remember the nature of what is happening in the student loan industry is being driven by a proactive decision of Congress to nationalize that area of student lending. That is problematic. We need to resolve that issue. It is an issue I want to continue to highlight in any debate that we have around student lending.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NUMBER 10 OFFERED BY MR. CASE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. CASE. Madam 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 36, line 25, strike "and".

Page 37, line 7, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 37, after line 7, insert the following:

"(C) ensure that at least 1 member is an expert in consumer privacy."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1500 which would ensure at least one member of the Consumer Advisory Board be an expert in privacy.

Over a decade ago, predatory lending and lax regulation led to one of the most devastating financial crises in our lifetime. The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, or CFPB, was established by the 2010 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in response to this crisis. The CFPB is tasked with implementing and enforcing federal consumer financial laws while ensuring consumer access to fair, transparent, and competitive financial products and services.

Under former Director Richard Cordray, the CFPB returned roughly \$12 billion to over 30 million consumers who fell victim to deceptive financial practices, handled over 1.2 million consumer complaints about financial firms, reined in payday lenders, examined mortgage and student loan servicers, combated discrimination in lending, and held a number of bad actors accountable.

Under this administration, the CFPB's leadership ordered a number of changes that weakened its ability to

protect consumers. This included firing members of the Consumer Advisory Board and reducing the size of the board. This hurt the CFPB's ability to help and protect consumers.

The board's experts help inform the CFPB about emerging practices and trends in the consumer finance industry and share analysis and recommendations. It helps ensure the government fully leverages expertise of those from outside of government.

H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act, would reverse anticonsumer changes taken by the administration and strengthen the Consumer Advisory Board. The bill would require the CFPB director to appoint at least 25 members, at least two-thirds of which would have to represent consumers, including fair lending and civil rights experts and representatives of communities affected by high-priced mortgages. My amendment would require at least one member of that board to be a demonstrated expert in privacy.

My amendment is needed because the interplay of privacy and technology in the financial landscape has changed dramatically since 2008. As internet connectivity increases, Americans now transmit more of their personal and financial information on the internet at exponentially higher rates than in the past, and their data is at risk.

Since 2013 there have been at least 10 major data breaches compromising billions of consumers. A number of these breaches exposed consumers' financial information. For example, Marriott International's 2018 breach compromised the personal information of some 500 million customers, including credit card numbers of more than 100 million. In 2017 Equifax was breached, exposing the personal information of 143 million consumers, including Social Security numbers. In 2014 the Nation's largest bank, JPMorgan Chase, was breached, compromising 76 million, or two in three U.S. households. The list, unfortunately, goes on and on.

In the wake of these high-profile data breaches and privacy violations, consumers are increasingly concerned about their online personal and financial privacy. A recent Pew Research Center public opinion study found that over half feel that their personal information is less secure than it was just 5 years ago, and 68 percent of internet users believe current laws are not good enough in protecting people's privacy online.

Our consumers are demanding action on the issue of privacy, and our privacy laws and enforcement significantly lag much of the rest of the world. Obviously, the current system is not working to ensure that personal privacy is protected.

My amendment responds to these concerns by ensuring that an expert in consumer privacy is part of the membership of the CFPB's Consumer Advisory Board. It will make sure that these concerns are front and center at the table as the board provides its advice to the CFPB.

My amendment is a small, yet important, nonpartisan amendment in response to the growing movement in Congress and across the Nation and world to protect consumers' personal data and basic right of privacy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, this amendment would ensure at least one member of the Consumer Advisory Board is an expert in consumer privacy. I think Congress has a proper role that they can exert in the make-up of boards, advisory boards, or make-up of commissions, and I think this is reasonable legislating around that.

We constantly hear from both financial firms and their regulators that cybersecurity and insufficient data privacy standards are significant threats to consumers and financial stability.

Moreover, as employees of the Federal Government, we know of Federal Government data breaches of Federal employees. We have to do more to make sure that we stop that and stop malicious state actors from these cyberattacks.

Billions of people were impacted by data breaches and cyberattacks in 2018 alone. The problem is only growing, and the threats are becoming much more sophisticated. Given the importance of this conversation, ensuring that one individual on the Consumer Advisory Board has consumer privacy expertise offers a reasonable solution.

Madam Chair, I commend my colleague from Hawaii for offering this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments of my colleague very much and the support. This clearly demonstrates that when it comes to consumer privacy, there is no party involved. We are all concerned about it regardless of our party. So I appreciate those comments.

I would only add that certainly this member of the board should deal not only with data breaches, but also with the basic rules and regulations that govern privacy. We need a large, massive, and increased broad government debate over our own rules on privacy in this country where, in fact, we do lag the rest of the world.

Madam Chair, I appreciate, again, my colleague's support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I commend my colleague for offering this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it. It is a reasonable step for Congress to say, clearly, that data breaches, cybersecurity, and personal privacy matter. As a matter of public policy, we need to be interested in it.



I would also urge my colleagues and reach out to the other side of the aisle for us to have a deeper conversation about cyber data and privacy. We need to legislate in these areas.

Without our taking action, we are allowing the Europeans to set the global standard, and we are allowing the European Union to set the standard for our data and privacy here in the United States. That is not appropriate. As American policymakers, we should be interested in legislating in a bipartisan way to achieve that type of data privacy and cybersecurity that is necessary for the American economy, not just in the short run, not just for the next election, but for the next generation to make sure that they are safe and secure.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." I commend my colleague for raising this important issue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam 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:

Page 36, line 20, after "communities," insert "representatives of servicemembers, veterans, and their families,".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I first want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her hard work and the hard work of the committee on behalf of American families in Maine and across the country who have fallen victim to financial schemes.

I rise today to offer my amendment on behalf of military servicemembers and veterans and their families. One of the challenges that military men and women face are countless financial scams that exist in the financial marketplace. Travel just outside of a military base, Madam Chair, and there will be payday lenders with high interest rates, title loan companies, and supplemental life insurance schemes all looking for their next target.

Military personnel who are distracted by financial problems created by these schemes cannot focus on doing their jobs to the best of their abilities. If the problems get out of hand, they can even end a military career. On average, thousands of servicemembers are separated each year from the military for financial hardship and other issues related to these types of schemes. Even worse, many servicemembers or their

families come under pressure from scammers while they are in the midst of a deployment.

Just as an example of this, I was in an infantry unit. I served in Afghanistan and Iraq. I have known people who have actually taken the time, when they get that rare opportunity, to hop on to a sat phone. They should be calling their family or a loved one, and instead they are calling to talk to a debt collector because they had fallen victim to one of these scams, then had it turned over to a debt collector. By law that is not supposed to happen, but too often servicemembers don't know what their rights are and what the law is, and they end up trying to deal with this kind of a stress while in the midst of a deployment to a place like Iraq.

We know it is not right. We need to make sure struggling military families can have resources that they can turn to for help.

Unfortunately, these challenges don't stop upon leaving the service either. According to a study done by the AARP, nearly eight in ten veterans report having received a scam attempt in the last 5 years. I get them myself. I get them in the mail. I get them from people talking to me about my VA home loan or education benefits and others, offering what sounds like a good deal, but we know it is not.

Recognizing the vulnerability of vets and servicemembers to predatory lenders and other financial scams, Congress created the Office of Servicemember Affairs at the CFPB. The office monitors complaints from servicemembers and veterans and their families and takes appropriate action to protect them.

Since 2011 the CFPB has received approximately 123,000 complaints from servicemembers, and the problem is not improving; it is actually getting worse. From 2016 to 2017, there was a 47 percent increase in complaints received from servicemembers.

My amendment helps ensure that the CFPB can better protect veterans and servicemembers from financial abuse, fraud, and scams. The provision opens up CFPB's Consumer Advisory Board to a representative veteran from the military community and the veterans' community.

The advisory board is a critical part of CFPB's role as a watchdog for consumers. They inform CFPB about emerging trends, they share analysis and recommendations for action and policies, and they assess the consumer impact of emerging financial products, practices, and services.

Putting a family member of a servicemember or a veteran on the advisory board will ensure that CFPB is better informed of new and emerging scams and tactics targeting servicemembers and veterans so that we are better able to protect them.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, this amendment will help ensure that servicemembers, veterans, and their families have representation on the CFPB's Consumer Advisory Board.

As I stated with the previous amendment, I think it is fair and just for Congress to make the decision on who should be members of the advisory boards, various agencies, and the make-up of boards and commissions as well as for government.

Congress' action in the past ensures that men and women serving our Nation do not fall victim to fraud and unscrupulous lenders, and this amendment is consistent with those efforts.

□ 1500

Moreover, I think there is a missed opportunity in this bill. Mr. BARR, my colleague from Kentucky, offered an amendment before the Rules Committee to this bill to say that the Military Lending Act gives explicit authority to the CFPB. That amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee. I think it was a bad decision.

If my colleague supports defending those in the military from unscrupulous action, I would encourage him to cosponsor Mr. BARR's amendment because it is conforming with his very concern about making sure that military families and veterans are protected. The Military Lending Act and the supervisory authority to the CFPB is just the way to do that.

I am supportive of that measure. It should have bipartisan support and should have been made in order under this amendment.

So, both sides of the aisle have these concerns. I am grateful that the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Texas have offered a good amendment.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I will go ahead and close and leave it to the gentleman to close on his end.

This amendment will help servicemembers, veterans, and their families make sure that they are protected financially and give them a voice at the table. I encourage my colleagues to support it. I thank the ranking member for encouraging his colleagues to support it as well.

I would be happy to talk to our colleague from Kentucky about ways in which we can work together to protect our servicemembers and veterans. I know we are all in on that together, to do the best that we can for our servicemembers and veterans.

Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member, the chairwoman, and the entire committee for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam 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 39, line 24, strike “AND” and insert a comma.

Page 39, line 25, insert before the period the following: “, AND MILITARY- AND VETERAN-SERVING FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS”.

Page 40, line 4, strike “and” and insert a comma.

Page 40, line 4, after “businesses” insert the following: “, and military- and veteran-serving financial institutions”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I would like to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her incredible work and leadership on this bill, which will help restore trust in Federal consumer protections and ensure those protections extend to all communities.

I also thank my colleague, Representative GOLDEN, for cosponsoring my amendment. This amendment would direct CFPB to include representatives of military- and veteran-serving financial institutions in their advisory committees.

There are over 18 million veterans in America today and nearly 3 million Department of Defense employees. Many in these communities choose to bank with financial institutions that cater to their unique needs. These over 20 million Americans deserve a voice at the CFPB from technical experts who know how to best serve our veterans and military.

We know that many military members pick a financial institution and stick with it. That is because these organizations have the skills and experience to help servicemembers with challenging circumstances, like frequent moves and deployments, that the average civilian customer won't face.

These organizations help support our veterans and military at critical life moments, providing early capital to help start a business, helping finance a new home, and even partnering with educational institutions to provide technical assistance to veteran entrepreneurs.

They know the unique needs and concerns of their clientele, including identity theft during deployments, VA loan issues, and improper credit reflections that occur when the VA experiences administrative delays.

And they can share key industry insight to help CFPB ensure vets and servicemembers are protected as they move through financial systems.

On a personal note, I share my home, El Paso, with nearly 50,000 veterans and am neighbors with more than 45,000 military and civilian personnel at Fort Bliss. At Fort Bliss, we also train units from every U.S. State and territory, so our amenities end up benefiting many outside our immediate community over time.

Communities like ours deserve to be heard, and my amendment will help ensure that that happens.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, this amendment will direct the CFPB to appoint representatives of the military- and veteran-serving financial institutions to advisory committees. It is another step in ensuring servicemembers, veterans, and their families have a voice in consumer protection.

Military- and veteran-serving financial institutions are unique and can provide the CFPB advisory boards with insights into the biggest risks facing veterans, servicemembers, and their families.

I do concur that there should be more military representation across all fronts at the CFPB and across the government.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers or comments. I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I urge a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam 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 40, after line 8, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON SENIOR CONSUMERS.**

Section 1016 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) REPORT ON SENIOR CONSUMERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall issue an annual report to Congress containing—

“(A) an analysis, in coordination with the Office of Financial Protection for Older Americans, of consumer complaints from older Americans, including a State-by-State breakdown of complaints by type of consumer financial product or service; and

“(B) any legislative or regulatory recommendations the Director may have to improve consumer protections for older Americans.

“(2) OLDER AMERICANS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘older Americans’ means individuals who have attained the age of 62 years or more.”.

Page 40, line 9, strike “SEC. 9” and insert “SEC. 10”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I first want to join my colleagues in thanking Chairwoman WATERS for her leadership for so many years and, in particular, her leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

We are here today to reinstate the powers of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which have been severely weakened, and it includes the curtailing of enforcement of fair lending laws and removing a standalone office on student loans. We must ensure, however, that our elderly population is included in this debate. We must not leave our elderly behind.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. It will require the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to issue an annual report to Congress of consumer complaints from older Americans, including a State-by-State breakdown of complaints by type of consumer financial product or service.

Madam Chair, studies show that people 50 and older hold 83 percent of the wealth in the United States. However, these same individuals, who grew up in a workforce very different than the evolving, technologically driven one of today and who are experiencing aging health disparities, are prime targets for scammers. This has resulted in our seniors losing anywhere from \$2.9 billion to \$36 billion each year from financial exploitation.

Having served as the director of my State's, Colorado's, Department of Regulatory Agencies in the past, I had the honor of working on behalf of Coloradans to protect them from unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent business practices. We certainly saw many of these practices up close.

While I am proud that our department was able to recover millions of dollars for consumers across Colorado, including senior citizens, we must do more. In an era of sophisticated targeting of our seniors, we must act, and I certainly believe that is the case at the Federal level.

So, in a world in which we continue to hear of calculated financial fraud and various data breaches, I believe we

should be working to protect all consumers, not making it easy for bad actors to take advantage of them, in particular, making sure that we protect vulnerable populations.

Madam Chair, that is why I encourage my colleagues to support this important amendment, and, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, older consumers are undoubtedly at the highest risk of becoming the victims of financial crimes. That is the unfortunate case that we are facing today.

That is why, earlier this month, the House passed multiple pieces of legislation to highlight the issues of elder financial abuse and the mechanisms to combat it.

The statistics on senior citizens who are exposed to financial exploitation are shocking. Older Americans lose approximately \$36.5 billion each year to financial crimes, scams, and abuse. One in five seniors have reported being victims of exploitation, and only 1 in 44 cases of financial abuse are reported.

The gentleman from Colorado has offered an amendment that will require the CFPB to study and report on consumer complaints filed by older Americans and recommend legislative or regulatory actions to enhance consumer protections to those citizens.

This amendment would increase transparency and allow the CFPB to identify trends in elder financial abuse. Those insights could be used and can be used to protect senior citizens.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." I thank my colleague for offering a good amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I thank the ranking member for his remarks, for articulating the need for this amendment, and for his support. I very much appreciate it.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam 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 36, line 25, strike "and".

Page 37, line 7, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 37, after line 7, insert the following:

"(C) seek to appoint individuals involved in the industries affected by the Bureau, including individuals who represent community banks, credit unions, small business owners, or experts in United States economic growth and jobs.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is an essential agency that has protected millions of consumers and put more than \$12 billion back in Americans' pockets.

I worked in the Obama administration, in the United States Department of the Treasury, when the CFPB was first established in the wake of the financial crisis and saw firsthand how this agency has grown to serve as a force for accountability, transparency, and fairness on behalf of working Americans. That is why it is so important to restore and protect the CFPB from the attempts to weaken this critical agency.

My amendment to the Consumers First Act ensures that community banks, credit unions, small business owners, or economic growth experts are appointed to serve as members of the Bureau's Consumer Advisory Board.

The Consumer Advisory Board is a resource for the CFPB, providing the agency with expertise, analysis, and recommendations.

We must keep the channels open to small businesses, smaller banks, credit unions, and community advocates. This amendment gives community-oriented small businesses a seat at the table when it comes to the CFPB's decisionmaking, while furthering the goal of ensuring our financial system works for everyone.

We need that on-the-ground information. We need to hear from our small businesses.

In my district, credit unions and community banks offer helpful resources to individual borrowers as they look to purchase a home, start a small business, or expand a manufacturing order.

These institutions have invaluable knowledge that we should take advantage of as we work to protect consumers from fraud and abuse.

My district, Michigan 11, is also home to several thousand small businesses, including manufacturers and the country's most robust automotive supply chain.

□ 1515

We have got retail, we have got restaurants, and we have the capability to continue to unlock the channels of innovation, but we need a CFPB that works for us, and we need the voice of the small business at the table.

Our small business owners contribute so much to our communities, and they have a finger on the pulse of our economy more than anyone else. We should welcome the expertise of these key stakeholders at the CFPB as they continue to do incredible work for the American people and our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, the gentlewoman from Michigan has offered an amendment that will help ensure the Consumer Advisory Board has a balanced perspective by including individuals who represent community banks, credit unions, and small business owners, or economic growth experts.

Community banks, credit unions, and small businesses are disproportionately affected by heightened regulatory burdens.

Dodd-Frank imposed 4,000 new Federal regulations on financial institutions, including smaller institutions that lack the resources of larger ones. As a result of that, we have seen the decline of nearly 2,000 banks, from about 6,400 banks at the end of 2010, to the end of last year, that number was 4,600. This is a significant issue for community financial institutions, the weight of regulation.

The number of credit unions has also declined by nearly 3,000 over a similar period of time, down to 5,600.

While community banking organizations, such as credit unions and small community banks, represent 17 percent of all U.S. bank assets, they make up nearly half of all small business loans. Small businesses account for over half of all U.S. employment, and nearly two-thirds of all employment growth over the last decade.

These institutions fuel our economy and spur job growth. They deserve a seat at the table.

I commend my colleague from Michigan for offering this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his celebratory remarks. This is an important day in Congress because this is the role that we play; overseeing agencies, strengthening their work and delivering for the American people.

I have got to applaud our chairwoman of Financial Services for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau work that she has done, particularly with this act. It is long overdue.

We are thrilled to introduce this amendment that will bring the voice of small business to the table.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I said, small community financial institutions have been disproportionately affected by the regulatory burden of Dodd-Frank, which has driven small community banks to either merge, or go out of business. Likewise, the same for credit unions.

So for them to have a seat at the table at the CFPB, I think, is right, fair, and appropriate. I appreciate my colleague from Michigan offering this. I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam 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 33, line 15, strike the quotation marks and final period and insert after such line the following:

"(5) COLLECTION OF STUDENT LOAN SERVICER DATA.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman shall require each servicer of student loans to submit an annual report to the Assistant Director with information regarding the servicer's loan portfolio, including data regarding the following:

"(i) The size of the servicer's portfolio.

"(ii) The repayment status of unique accounts.

"(iii) Borrower-initiated and servicer-initiated contacts, and the outcome of each such contact.

"(iv) Income-driver repayment applications and recertifications.

"(v) Any other data the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman determines necessary to carry out the functions of the Office of Students and Young Consumers.

"(B) REPORT.—The Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman shall include, in each report required under section 1035(d)(1), a description of the information collected under this paragraph, along with any findings or determinations the Assistant Director made with respect to such information.

"(C) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall issue guidance to student loan servicers to facilitate the data collection required under this paragraph."

Page 40, line 8, after the second dollar figure insert "(decreased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Chair, first of all, let me recognize the chair of the committee, my friend from California, for her steadfast work to defend American consumers.

Madam Chair, students are in a difficult situation nowadays in the knowledge-based economy, where we are told over and over again that America, to be competitive, has to have an educated workforce, and we need more and more young people to go into college and then to graduate school; not to say that we don't have needs for people to get out of high school and go into career tech.

But these generations are burdened with unbelievable student loans, and they are also burdened with, in urban areas, high housing costs and also lower wage expectations. We have to fix this; and one way to fix it is to have more oversight and performance standards for those companies, those for-profit companies, in particular, that control 93 percent of the market of Federal student loans.

Madam Chair, 44 million Americans hold an estimated \$1.5 trillion in student debt. Over 1 million borrowers defaulted on their student loans last year.

Default is a financially devastating event that affects the individuals many times for the rest of their lives, as it affects their credit standing and also their ability to get a house, and to get a good job. Default is a financially-devastating event, as I said.

In the past decade, the Federal Government created several repayment plans designed to assist borrowers in financial distress, but the default rate remains stubbornly high.

One major reason is the student loan servicing industry. These for-profit companies operate with little oversight nor accountability.

Evidence shows that servicers often provide inaccurate information and inadequate customer service, making the already complicated process of enrolling in the correct repayment plan close to impossible.

My amendment would simply require the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to collect and publish data from student loan servicers, providing a first-ever look at how these companies perform at serving American consumers. That is important.

These are basic performance standards that I would think all of my colleagues across the aisle would want in any business practice—particularly for-profit companies—they would want performance standards for them, if they are publicly-traded they would want them for the shareholders and, most importantly, for American consumers and students.

For example, this amendment would show if student loan servicers are making it easy for their customers to recertify their incomes for their repayment plans. We know that this is a common roadblock to successful repayment.

This amendment would simply require the CFPB to fulfill their statutory duty and provide needed oversight and transparency of this important industry. Everybody should agree that more information, in this instance in particular, is in everyone's interest and everyone's interest in the future of this country and future generations.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I am opposed to the amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this issue, but I have concerns with this amendment.

Before I get into the substance of the amendment, I do want to remind my colleagues that the Democrat majority, in 2009 and 2010, passed through the House and the Senate, and got signed by the President, the nationalization of the student loan industry, giving it to the Department of Education to administer.

Knowing their limitations, the Department of Education, at the time, contracted with loan servicers that are private enterprises, but under the direction and the regulatory enforcement of the Department of Education.

Now, the Democrat majority is unhappy, and the Federal Government is crushing an entire generation with debt by the decision they made to help pay for the ACA or ObamaCare.

To get to the substance of the amendment, this amendment would require loan servicers to submit considerable data to the CFPB, data that they are already submitting to their primary regulator, the Department of Education.

I am troubled by the sheer volume of information that would be collected and by the lack of definitive guardrails around what the CFPB can and cannot collect.

We had an amendment before that said we need to have on the Advisory Committee a privacy expert. Well, this amendment runs counter to this need for us to have enhanced privacy standards for those that are seeking loans, and enhanced privacy standards for individuals in society, because this would now require a second area of government to collect data, sometimes counter to what the Department of Education would suggest is the right and proper data to collect.

The Department of Education has authority over student loan servicing, and that work is performed on the Department's behalf under its regulation. And the servicers fall under the Department of Education's regulatory authority broadly.

While I support the spirit of this amendment that was offered, I ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Chair, just briefly, while I respect some of the issues brought up by my colleague, I do think, if the data is already there and they are supplying it for the Department of Education, we should make it relatively easy for the Consumer Protection Bureau to get that same information and, if needed, get more.

As a former business owner, these are the kind of performance standards I would not be afraid to show to my clients; and I would think that Congress and the American people, considering the importance of this investment, at a minimum, would require these kind of performance standards.

So I would hope that Members on both sides of the aisle would support the effort in a spirit of transparency, and performance standards for privately-held companies.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, in closing, this amendment is not practical. It should be offered when we reauthorize the Department of Education. I would support it if it is mandated on the part of the Department of Education to collect this data, which is the right regulator of this nationalized industry of making student loans.

Rather than collecting more data, what we need to do is get into the action of fixing the problem of student debt. We need to make sure we have more choices for students, better communication with students, and a better understanding of the consequences of this massive debt load.

We can collect all the data we want, but the Federal Government will eventually have to take responsibility for these bad actions we have taken to saddle a generation with student debt that they cannot afford. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam 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 40, line 8, after the second dollar figure insert “(decreased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 40, after line 8, insert the following:

**SEC. 9. REPORT ON PAYDAY LOAN AND CAR-TITLE LOAN INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.**

Section 1016 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) REPORT ON PAYDAY LOAN AND CAR-TITLE LOAN INVESTIGATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—The Director shall issue a quarterly report to Congress containing—

“(1) the number of investigations opened and closed by the Bureau relating to payday loans and car-title loans;

“(2) the number of enforcement actions that have been taken or referred relating to payday loans and car-title loans;

“(3) an estimate of the amount of fees customers have paid relating to payday loans and car-title loans;

“(4) an estimate of the number of times in the previous 12 months a typical payday loan customer has rolled over their loan; and

“(5) an estimate of how many car-title loan customers lost their car in the previous 12 months.”.

Page 40, line 9, strike “SEC. 9” and insert “SEC. 10”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I am proud to be a supporter of H.R. 1500, the Consumers First Act. The act ensures that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau serves its statutory purpose of protecting consumers from unfair, abusive practices, and holding greedy corporations accountable when they take advantage of people in our communities.

The residents of the 13th District in Michigan are charged a whopping 369 percent APR rate by payday lenders.

According to the Center for Responsible Lending, payday loans drain over \$4.1 billion in fees a year from people in 35 States that allow triple digit interest rates for payday loans. Car title loans drain over \$3.8 billion in fees annually from people in 22 States.

Madam Chair, together, these loans drain nearly \$8 billion in fees every year, money that should be going to pay rent or buy groceries. Instead, it is going to line the pockets of predatory lenders who are making record profits.

Across Michigan, 600 payday lending storefronts each issue 3,000 loans a year. Most of those loans are used by a borrower to repay their prior loans; and 90 percent of these loan borrowers in Michigan re-borrow within 60 days.

This is why I am offering an amendment that ensures that our residents are protected from predatory lending in the payday and auto loan industries. This amendment will provide those of us in Congress with the information necessary to know how these industries are operating and how our residents are being impacted directly.

A doctor can't treat a disease without the necessary lab work or research. This also applies to our ability, as public servants, to push back against these loans being offered in all corners of our communities that push our residents more into poverty.

□ 1530

This payday lending amendment would require the CFPB to report to

Congress quarterly the number of investigations opened and closed relating to payday and car title lenders.

It requires an oversight report every quarter on the number of enforcement actions, an estimate of how much in fees payday or car title customers pay, how many times in the previous 12 months payday customers rolled over their loans, and how many car title loan borrowers lost their cars in the previous 12 months.

Madam Chair, we have a responsibility to tackle this debt trap crisis that is set up for more profits for corporations but leaves the American people in financial despair with no escape.

In Michigan, predatory lenders are looking to squeeze money out of low-income people with deceptive and abusive practices and have, unfortunately, found a steady stream of business back home in our districts.

Taking advantage of people in difficult situations is immoral, but companies continue to stretch and break the law for an extra buck, regardless of the human cost.

In my district, Detroiters with payday loans are more likely to file for bankruptcy, be evicted, or face utility shutoffs than any other Detroiters without payday loans.

Madam Chair, I say to my colleagues, these numbers are not unique to the State of Michigan. Our constituents are being harmed by these abusive, greedy practices, and we have to make sure we have all the information we need to take action and protect our families.

We know that many consumers who are forced to get high-interest, high-fees payday loans are targeted low-income families. Many are taken advantage of because they have relatively few other places to turn.

According to the New York Fed, more Americans than ever were at least 3 months behind on their auto loans, and it said delinquencies were worsening among subprime borrowers. Auto debt is now nearing \$1.3 trillion.

Madam Chair, many of our constituents are a missed payday or a family emergency away from being forced to rely on payday loans or missing an auto payment. Many are already in that position. It is our job to make sure we have the information necessary in this body to protect them.

Madam Chair, this amendment strengthens consumer protection, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I would ask the author for a point of clarification.

As I read it, the amendment requires quarterly reporting to Congress. Is that correct?

Ms. TLAIB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCHENRY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. TLAIB. Yes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Am I to read it correctly that that quarterly report is supposed to give 12 months of data?

Ms. TLAIB. Correct.

Mr. MCHENRY. Okay. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for clarifying.

Madam Chair, looking at this, that means that on a quarterly basis, it is an annual report. It is a bit clunky.

What we already see with the issues of payday and car title lenders, we know that those are State-regulated products, but we also know, according to the Bureau's 2018 Consumer Response Annual Report, payday loans account for 0.7 percent of consumer complaints, title loans account for 0.2 percent of consumer complaints. This is less than 1 percent of the consumer complaints the CFPB already deals with.

The issues of reporting here, if this were merely an annual report to reposition the data that they put out on an annual basis, I would not see that as a burden or a major cost to the CFPB, but doing an annual report on a quarterly basis would be more costly.

While I am not opposed to this data being made public—I do think that would be additive to the public—the fact that this is a quarterly filing for an annual report, I don't think that that is going to be quite as sensible as it otherwise could be.

Moreover, if you look at the Consumer Response Annual Report on the consumer complaints to the CFPB, 80 percent of those consumer complaints revolve around the credit reporting agencies and credit repair firms.

I think we should be focused on that, as a policy matter. I think there is bipartisan consensus that the credit reporting agencies need to undergo a change in the law by which they must abide to make sure that consumers are protected and their data is protected.

This is bipartisan work that I hope Chairwoman WATERS and I can engage in this Congress. We have raised similar concerns about credit reporting agencies in the past, and I do think there is an opportunity for us to have bipartisan legislating that protects the consumer.

Madam Chair, I commend my colleague from Michigan for offering this. I know this is a major issue in Michigan and a major issue for the question of car insurance, the cost of car insurance as well, and a number of other issues that I know that she seeks to remedy for her constituents.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman raising this concern to us as a body, but I respectfully oppose the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I do want to clarify to my good colleague that this is not an annual report.

We want to know, every quarter, changes in payday complaints. So just

be aware that this is about a quarterly report regarding those changes. This is not an annual report.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Chair, I do want to note the burden outweighs the cost on our residents back home.

We need to be able to know exactly what is happening on the ground at home in regard to these kinds of practices and abusive behavior by payday lenders.

We as a body need transparency and understanding of what is going through the CFPB, and we are not able to remedy these challenges for our residents without that information.

Madam Chair, I hope that we can agree this is a bipartisan issue. This would impact a majority of our States across this Nation.

Madam Chair, again, I hope I can get some support from my good colleague, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, in my reading of the bill, I would suggest that when it says, "the Director shall issue a quarterly report to Congress containing," and then in subsections 4 and 5 it says 12 months of data, that 12 months is—I don't want to be snarky about it, but 12 months is a year.

So on a quarterly basis, CFPB has to provide 12 months of data. That is what I mean by on a quarterly basis CFPB has to provide an annual report. Twelve months being a year, a year being annual, filing yearly is annual.

I don't mean to be completely snarky about it, but I think if we simply had an annual report, this would be a much better structured amendment.

Madam Chair, while I oppose the amendment, I do so reluctantly.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in part A of House Report 116-79.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam 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 31, after line 5, insert the following:

(g) RESTORATION OF RULE PROHIBITING FORCED ARBITRATION IN CONSUMER CONTRACTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—Public Law 115-74 is hereby repealed.

(2) RESTORATION OF RULE.—Not later than the end of the 3-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall reissue the final rule of the Bureau specified in Public Law 115-74 (relating to "Arbitration Agreements") in the same form as such rule

existed on the day before the date of enactment of Public Law 115-74, except the Bureau shall specify that the rule takes effect after the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date such rule is reissued.

Page 40, line 8, after the second dollar figure insert "(decreased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 389, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I am honored to present amendment No. 17, which deals with consumer choice. It deals with whether consumers will be forced into arbitration or whether they will have the choice of having arbitration or litigation.

With litigation, the consumer can have the choice of having the case presented as one person or as part of a group.

This amendment is one that the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act called to our attention by way of a study that was required.

After performing the study, the CFPB issued a final rule to regulate the use of mandatory arbitration clauses. In so doing, it was something that we believed would have been beneficial to consumers. Yet, before the rule could take effect, it was rescinded by Congress in November 2017.

My amendment offers a direct, straightforward solution. It simply reinstates the CFPB final rule, a rule that was the product of a careful study. It was analyzed properly. It was done by way of stakeholder consensus.

My belief is that this rule will reinstate a law that will give consumers choice as opposed to forced administration.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Green amendment.

Madam Chair, to the Members of this House, when we file into this room, we file past a three-times-life-size statue of Thomas Jefferson, one of our Founders in this Nation. And Jefferson said he considered a trial by jury "as the only anchor, ever yet imagined by man, by which a government can be held to the principles of its constitution."

Trial by jury was that important to Thomas Jefferson that he said it was that important.

DANIEL WEBSTER, who is quoted up here on our wall, said, "The law: It has honored us." Let us honor it by executing it in its fullest severity.

How do we do that? We allow jury trials for American citizens.

We teach our children accountability, responsibility, being accountable for your actions. The way to do it in America is to allow jury trials to decide who is at fault.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).



Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, I rise only to commend the gentleman from Texas for his important work on this arbitration issue.

There has been a very effective movement to quash the rights of consumers. In the financial services area, people are told to deal with it.

Our colleague HANK JOHNSON has the Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act as it relates to nursing homes and employment. Our colleague KATHERINE CLARK has a bill to repeal these arbitration restrictions with reference to discrimination on the basis of sex and sexual harassment in the workplace. Each of these is very important.

Arbitration is arbitrary. It does not fairly resolve disputes. It is biased toward the financial institution, and toward the employer and others in other cases. Arbitration is a model that does not work well to solve most disputes of this type.

It has even been suggested, amazingly enough, to bring arbitration into the drug price debate now. I don't believe arbitration is a way to solve these problems, and it is certainly not a way to get us lower drug prices.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, the gentleman's amendment would reinstate a bad rule by the CFPB that was repealed.

The CFPB's own data demonstrates that consumers fare better under arbitration than under litigation. On average, plaintiffs' attorneys account for approximately 31 percent of payments plaintiffs receive from class action settlements. Plaintiffs' attorneys collect, on average, \$1 million per case; actual plaintiffs receive just \$32 each.

If Members want to be consumer friendly, if Members are about consumer protection, let's let the consumers get the benefit if they are wronged rather than trial lawyers and the trial bar.

This is a trial lawyer's dream amendment.

Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment and ask my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman in opposition, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), has the right to close.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, this is a consumer's dream come true because it gives the consumer choice.

It does not deny the business owner, the credit card company, or the bank the opportunity to have arbitration. What it does is it allows the consumer to have the choice to either elect to have arbitration or to go to litigation, and when litigating, the consumer can litigate as an individual.

□ 1545

When I was a judge of a small claims court, I had many persons who were litigating their cases before me. I also understand that there are times when people believe that they should have lawyers to represent them. It is not unusual for businesses to have lawyers to represent them. In fact, businesses have lawyers on call to represent them 24 hours a day.

Why can consumers not have the same opportunity to litigate that businesses have to litigate? That is what this is all about. My colleague, on the other side, would simply have consumers have no choice, go to arbitration only, and then, possibly, gain some emolument.

My belief is that consumers ought to have choice. That is what this amendment is about.

Madam Chair, this is part of the reason why consumers are so angry with this Congress. We deny them their constitutional rights, the right to a trial and the right to make a determination for themselves as to whether or not they will engage in arbitration or litigation.

Consumers should have choices. Businesses have choices. Consumers should have no less than what businesses have.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, let me just reiterate: This amendment is for trial lawyers. That is what they are trying to reinstate, forcing consumers into the hands of trial lawyers. Every million dollars plaintiffs receive in attorney's fees, the actual plaintiff, the one who is harmed, the one who is wronged, receives, on average, \$32. That is not fair. That is not equitable. That is not right.

It is not defending an abstract concept. It is actually defending those consumers' right to receive compensation for the harm that they have experienced. Also, it allows that consumer to enter into contractual agreements with people they seek to.

This amendment would reinstate a rule that would take that consumer's right away from them and put it into the hands of the trial lawyer once again. It is a profit center. It certainly is.

In November last year, the President signed a joint resolution passed by Congress disapproving of the arbitration rule under the Congressional Review Act. Congress spoke, in the House and in the Senate, and we changed the law.

Pursuant to the joint resolution, the arbitration agreement rule has no force

or effect. That means, moreover, that a rule similar to that can no longer be written going forward. That is under the Congressional Review Act.

This amendment serves as little more than a payday for plaintiffs' attorneys.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam 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 Texas will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 116-79 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. STEIL of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment No. 14 by Ms. STEVENS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. GREEN of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. STEIL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 190, noes 234, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

AYES—190

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



Estes  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxx (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
González-Colón  
(PR)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)

King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Radewagen  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)

Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

## NOES—234

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Amash  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
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  
Cleave  
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  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
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  
Lowey  
Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle

Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norton  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarelli  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Plaskett  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)

Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sablan  
San Nicolas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradner  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stanton

## NOT VOTING—13

Armstrong  
Hartzler  
Herrera Beutler  
Hudson  
Kinzinger

Lamborn  
Meeks  
Norcross  
Stivers

Swalwell (CA)  
Turner  
Walker

## □ 1619

Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Messrs. GOTTHEIMER, PHILLIPS, SCOTT of Virginia, PANETTA, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, CONNOLLY, McEACHIN, SCHRADER, TAKANO, WELCH, and COHEN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TIPTON, SMUCKER, BURGESS, OLSON, POSEY, ROY, ABRAHAM, WEBSTER of Florida, WESTERMAN, and BISHOP of Utah changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 236, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

## AYES—191

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bacon  
Baird

Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady

Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne

Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxx (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
González-Colón  
(PR)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)

Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)

Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

## NOES—236

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
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  
Cleave  
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  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
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)  
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)	Pappas	Sherrill
Lewis	Pascrell	Sires
Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Slotkin
Lipinski	Peters	Smith (WA)
Loebsock	Peterson	Soto
Lofgren	Phillips	Spanberger
Lowenthal	Pingree	Speier
Lowe	Plaskett	Stanton
Lujan	Pocan	Stevens
Luria	Porter	Suozzi
Lynch	Pressley	Takano
Malinowski	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Maloney,	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Carolyn B.	Raskin	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Tlaib
Matsui	Richmond	Tonko
McAdams	Rose (NY)	Torres (CA)
McBath	Rouda	Torres Small
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	(NM)
McEachin	Ruiz	Trahan
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Trone
McNerney	Rush	Underwood
Meng	Ryan	Van Drew
Moore	Sablan	Vargas
Morelle	San Nicolas	Veasey
Moulton	Sánchez	Vela
Mucarsel-Powell	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Murphy	Scanlon	Visclosky
Nadler	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Napolitano	Schiff	Schultz
Neal	Schneider	Waters
Neguse	Schrader	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Schrier	Welch
Norton	Scott (VA)	Wexton
O'Halleran	Scott, David	Wild
Ocasio-Cortez	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Omar	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Pallone	Shalala	
Panetta	Sherman	

## NOT VOTING—10

Armstrong	Kinzing	Swalwell (CA)
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Walker
Hudson	Payne	
Kaptur	Stivers	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1629

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to speak out of order.)

## HONORING USCP CHIEF VERDEROSA

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I am pleased to rise to join our distinguished Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, to honor the dedicated, distinguished service of an outstanding public servant, United States Capitol Police Chief Matthew Verderosa.

Madam Chair, throughout 34 years in law enforcement, Police Chief Verderosa has proven himself as a leader of the highest patriotism and professionalism and has proudly carried forth the Capitol Police's nearly two-century history of storied service.

Chief Verderosa has held seemingly every consequential job in the Capitol Police, from the fields of emergency response, to dignitary protection, to the highest ranks of leadership.

Through it all, he has distinguished himself for his strong, steady leadership, particularly during some of the most challenging times for the Capitol Police force and the Congress.

That outstanding leadership was on display after the 2017 congressional baseball shooting, 2 years ago next month. Chief Verderosa responded to that attack with courage, vision, and grace, bringing help and healing to those affected and to our entire congressional community.

In every day of his tenure, he has led with those same qualities, navigating everything from mass protests, to the more than 11 million annual visitors to the Capitol Grounds, to multiple Lying in State and Lying in Honor ceremonies.

Chief Verderosa has earned the respect of all: the rank-and-file officers of the Capitol Police, Members of Congress, foreign dignitaries, and the American people.

On a personal note, as someone who benefits from the protection of the Capitol Police every day and everywhere I go, I want to express my gratitude to Chief Verderosa for his hard work and commitment to the safety of all Members.

In his retirement statement, Chief Verderosa said: "The mission of the department is simple. We protect the legislative process."

Chief Verderosa, thank you for your relentless dedication to protecting the legislative process and this legislative body, ensuring that the people's House can do the people's work. We are profoundly grateful. We wish you well in your well-earned retirement.

Madam Chair, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), who is the Republican leader of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Chair, I thank the Speaker for yielding, and I thank her for her words. I want to join the Speaker in thanking the chief.

Three decades, 34 years—it is not a job; it is a way of life when you become a police officer. Your job is a little different, and we see it each and every day.

Think of the complexity of being a Capitol Police officer. It is not just the safety of the women and men who serve in here; it is the thousands of visitors who come every day. But it is also the responsibility of keeping a government by the people, for the people, and of the people open.

Every day we see it, and we all have felt it. It is not just protecting us when it is inside this building. We saw it just a short time ago on a baseball field. We are reminded of the number of Members' lives your officers saved that day.

We are reminded of the number of times, just in a building that the majority leader room has, of the officers giving the ultimate sacrifice inside these Hallowed Halls to save the others.

So we thank you for your work, but, more importantly, we thank you for the force. We thank you for all the officers.

We know last week was National Police Week. They were here in the Capitol and throughout Washington, D.C. We know every day that we hear the other lives that were lost protecting us throughout the Nation.

We thank you for your service, and on behalf of a very grateful Congress, thank you for your decades of service, and we wish you all the best in retirement.

## AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes 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 Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 235, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

## AYES—192

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

## NOES—235

Adams	Allred	Barragán
Aguilar	Axne	Bass

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

## NOT VOTING—10

Armstrong	Meeks	Walker
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Yarmuth
Hudson	Stivers	
Kinzinger	Swalwell (CA)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1642

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the

gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STE-  
VENS) 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 amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 418, noes 10,  
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

## AYES—418

Abraham	Connolly	Gottheimer
Adams	Cook	Granger
Aderholt	Cooper	Graves (GA)
Aguiar	Correa	Graves (LA)
Allen	Costa	Graves (MO)
Allred	Courtney	Green (TX)
Amodei	Cox (CA)	Griffith
Arrington	Craig	Grijalva
Axne	Crawford	Grothman
Babin	Crenshaw	Guest
Bacon	Crist	Guthrie
Baird	Crow	Haaland
Balderson	Cuellar	Hagedorn
Banks	Cummings	Harder (CA)
Barr	Cunningham	Hartzler
Barragán	Curtis	Hastings
Bass	Davids (KS)	Hayes
Beatty	Davidson (OH)	Heck
Bera	Davis (CA)	Hice (GA)
Bergman	Davis, Danny K.	Higgins (LA)
Beyer	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (NY)
Bilirakis	Dean	Hill (AR)
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hill (CA)
Bishop (UT)	DeGette	Himes
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Holding
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Hollingsworth
Bonamici	Delgado	Horn, Kendra S.
Bost	Demings	Horsford
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeSaulnier	Houlahan
Brady	DesJarlais	Hoyer
Brindisi	Deutch	Huffman
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Hunter
Brown (MD)	Doggett	Hurd (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jackson Lee
Buchanan	Duffy	Jayapal
Buck	Duncan	Jeffries
Bucshon	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Budd	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Burchett	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Escobar	Johnson (SD)
Bustos	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)
Butterfield	Espallat	Jordan
Byrne	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Calvert	Evans	Joyce (PA)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Kaptur
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Carson (IN)	Fleischmann	Keating
Carter (GA)	Fletcher	Kelly (IL)
Carter (TX)	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Cartwright	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Case	Foster	Kennedy
Casten (IL)	Fox (NC)	Khanna
Castor (FL)	Frankel	Kildee
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Kilmer
Chabot	Fulcher	Kim
Cheney	Gabbard	Kind
Chu, Judy	Gallagher	King (NY)
Ciilline	Galleo	Kirkpatrick
Cisneros	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Kuster (NH)	Kustoff (TN)
Clarke (NY)	García (IL)	LaHood
Clay	García (TX)	Lamb
Cleaver	Gianforte	Lamborn
Cline	Gibbs	Langevin
Cloud	Gohmert	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Golden	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Gomez	Latta
Cole	Gonzalez (OH)	Lawrence
Collins (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lawson (FL)
Collins (NY)	González-Colón	Lee (CA)
Comer	(PR)	Lee (NV)
Conaway	Gooden	Lesko
	Gosar	

Levin (CA)	Perlmutter	Smucker
Levin (MI)	Perry	Soto
Lewis	Peters	Spanberger
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Spano
Lipinski	Phillips	Speier
Loeb sack	Pingree	Stanton
Lofgren	Plaskett	Stauber
Long	Pocan	Stefanik
Loudermilk	Porter	Steil
Lowenthal	Posey	Steube
Lowe y	Pressley	Stevens
Lucas	Price (NC)	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Quigley	Suo zzi
Luján	Radewagen	Takano
Luria	Raskin	Taylor
Lynch	Ratcliffe	Thompson (CA)
Malinowski	Reed	Thompson (MS)
Maloney,	Reschenthaler	Thompson (PA)
Carolyn B.	Rice (NY)	Thornberry
Maloney, Sean	Rice (SC)	Timmons
Marchant	Richmond	Tipton
Marshall	Riggleman	Titus
Massie	Roby	Tlaib
Mast	Rodgers (WA)	Tonko
Matsui	Roe, David P.	Torres (CA)
McAdams	Rogers (AL)	Torres Small
McBath	Rogers (KY)	(NM)
McCarthy	Rooney (FL)	Trahan
McCaul	Rose (NY)	Trone
McCollum	Rose, John W.	Turner
McEachin	Rouda	Underwood
McGovern	Rouzer	Upton
McHenry	Roy	Van Drew
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
McNerney	Ruiz	Veasey
Meadows	Ruppersberger	Vela
Meng	Rush	Velázquez
Meuser	Rutherford	Visclosky
Miller	Ryan	Wagner
Mitchell	Sablan	Walberg
Moolenaar	San Nicolas	Walden
Mooney (WV)	Sánchez	Walorski
Moore	Sarbanes	Waltz
Morelle	Scalise	Wasserman
Moulton	Scanlon	Schultz
Mucarsel-Powell	Schakowsky	Waters
Mullin	Schiff	Watkins
Murphy	Schneider	Watson Coleman
Nadler	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Napolitano	Schrier	Webster (FL)
Neal	Schweikert	Welch
Neguse	Scott (VA)	Wenstrup
Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Norcross	Scott, David	Wexton
Norman	Sensenbrenner	Wild
Norton	Serrano	Williams
Nunes	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
O'Halleran	Shalala	Wilson (SC)
Ocasio-Cortez	Sherman	Wittman
Olson	Sherrill	Womack
Omar	Shimkus	Woodall
Palazzo	Simpson	Wright
Pallone	Sires	Yarmuth
Palmer	Slotkin	Yoho
Panetta	Smith (MO)	Young
Pappas	Smith (NE)	Zeldin
Pascrell	Smith (NJ)	
Pence	Smith (WA)	

## NOES—10

Amash	Green (TN)	LaMalfa
Biggs	Harris	McClintock
Ferguson	Hern, Kevin	
Gaetz	King (IA)	

## NOT VOTING—9

Armstrong	Kinzinger	Stivers
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Hudson	Payne	Walker

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1648

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentlewoman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) 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 Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 193, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

#### AYES—235

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

Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez

Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman

Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

#### NOES—193

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

Gonzalez (OH)  
González-Colón  
(PR)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaull  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Norman

Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Radewagen  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westernman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

#### NOT VOTING—9

Armstrong  
Herrera Beutler  
Hudson

Kinzinger  
Meeks  
Payne

Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Walker

□ 1654

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

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. BARRAGÁN). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) having assumed the chair, Ms. BARRAGÁN, 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. 1500) to require the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to meet its statutory purpose, and

for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 389, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments 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 further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. STEIL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steil moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1500 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 40, after line 8, insert the following:

#### SEC. 9. PAYMENTS TO VICTIMS FROM THE CIVIL PENALTY FUND.

Paragraph (2) of section 1017(d) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) PAYMENTS TO VICTIMS.—No funds from the Civil Penalty Fund shall be made available for any purpose other than compensating actual victims of activities for which civil penalties have been imposed under Federal consumer financial laws.”.

Page 40, line 9, strike “SEC. 9” and insert “SEC. 10”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

□ 1700

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, the Dodd-Frank Act created the Consumer Financial Civil Penalty Fund, into which the Bureau deposits civil penalties it collects from wrongdoers.

Civil penalties should be used exclusively to make victims of financial consumer crimes whole. We should track down actual victims of fraud. However, current law allows the Bureau to use this account as a slush fund.

We should give the money back to the victims.

This motion would put an end to the CFPB slush fund. This motion requires the CFPB to do the right thing: Give the money to the victims.

The CFPB's ability to take away penalty funds and use them in unaccountable ways is unparalleled among financial regulators.

Where does this money go?

Both the Government Accountability Office and the Federal Reserve's Inspector General, which oversees the CFPB, found that the CFPB lacks internal procedures. The CFPB lacks accountability. The CFPB lacks transparency.

Where does this money go?

Let's put an end to the slush fund at the Bureau. Let's redirect where this money belongs. Let's give the money to the victims.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to recommit.

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

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today, not just as a new Member of Congress, but as someone who has spent my career as a consumer protection lawyer studying families pushed to the brink of financial ruin.

I have sat all day long listening to the personal stories of families driven to bankruptcy by predatory loans, financial scams, and unlawful and immoral debt collectors.

I rise today as someone who has personally spoken to thousands of families in foreclosure; as someone who has had to look into the eyes of parents and children and tell them: "I'm sorry, but the bank is going to take your house."

These are not experiences that someone can forget. I carry these stories of California families with me every day. That is why I ran for office. It is why I stand up for a level playing field for families.

I cannot fathom how the minority, with this amendment, is shrugging off the devastation of the 2008 collapse.

Ten years ago, in 2009, Orange County was coming off a year when home prices fell 30 percent. Imagine being a family planning for retirement and, all of a sudden, your primary source of security is gone.

Ten years ago, in May 2009, California had an unemployment rate of 11 percent.

Do Members of this body not remember how many of our friends and neighbors spent sleepless nights wondering if they could keep a roof over their heads?

The 2008 economic collapse cast a long shadow. One study from the CDC found that suicides, spurred by evictions and foreclosures, doubled between 2005 and 2010. Those are going to be difficult victims to locate.

Because of this human tragedy, Congress acted and created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an agency whose sole focus is to ensure that financial services companies and Wall

Street megabanks could not again cheat families and tank our economy.

We created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, even though special interests were spending \$3 million a day to defeat it. Think about it; an industry so wealthy that even in its collapse, they had \$40 million to spend on lobbyists.

Now these same special interests are, again, attacking the CFPB. This amendment is just another effort by the same Members who voted against the agency's effectiveness.

In my nearly 2 decades as a consumer advocate, I have never met a single American, Democrat, Republican, or Independent, who likes being cheated. If the Members today were listening to their constituents, and not special interests, they would support the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

I am a proud capitalist, and it is in that deep belief in healthy and strong markets, that I rise today in opposition to this motion to recommit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 231, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

AYES—191

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)

Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz

Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)

Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)

Mullin  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)

Smucker  
Spano  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho  
Young  
Zeldin

#### NOES—231

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
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

Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebach  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
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)

Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger

Speier  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Suozzi  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood

Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—9

Armstrong  
Herrera Beutler  
Hudson

Kinzinger  
Meeks  
Payne

Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Walker

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1712

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.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STEIL. 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 231, noes 191, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

## AYES—231

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
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  
Ciilline  
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  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
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  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Luria  
Lynch  
Malinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Murphy  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell

Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires

## NOES—191

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

Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hern, Kevin  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill (AR)  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kustoff (TN)  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lesko  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meadows  
Meuser  
Miller  
Mitchell

Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
Roby  
Rodgers (WA)  
Roe, David P.  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Rose, John W.  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spano  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack

Woodall  
Wright  
Yoho

Young  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—9

Armstrong  
Herrera Beutler  
Hudson

Kinzinger  
Meeks  
Payne

Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Walker

□ 1724

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. OMAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## S. CON. RES. 14

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

## SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on June 9, 2019, for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT IN MEMORY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, GEORGE HERBERT WALKER BUSH

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## S. CON. RES. 6

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*



**SECTION 1. COMMEMORATIVE DOCUMENT AUTHORIZED.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—A commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush, shall be printed as a House document, with illustrations and suitable binding, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) CONTENTS.—The document shall consist of the eulogies and encomiums for George Herbert Walker Bush, as expressed in the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with the texts of each of the following:

(1) The state funeral ceremony at the United States Capitol Rotunda.

(2) The national funeral service held at the Washington National Cathedral, Washington, District of Columbia.

(3) The memorial service held at St. Martin's Episcopal Church, Houston, Texas.

(4) The interment ceremony at the George Herbert Walker Bush Presidential Library Center, College Station, Texas.

**SEC. 2. PRINTING OF DOCUMENT.**

In addition to the usual number of copies printed, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 32,500 copies of the commemorative document, of which 22,150 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 10,350 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; or

(2) such number of copies of the commemorative document that does not exceed a production and printing cost of \$1,000,000, with distribution of the copies to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1).

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. ESTES. 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, 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. ESTES. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

□ 1730

**HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Ms. KAPTUR. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

**HONORING NURSES**

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of all the nurses, the healers who tirelessly serve patients across our Nation. I thank them for their dedicated service to heal, care for, and serve people across all our communities.

Our country is facing a dire shortage of healthcare workers. Whether nurses, primary care physicians, psychiatrists, behavioral health specialists, or technicians, you name it, the growing shortage of workers is exacerbating the already high cost of healthcare, making high-quality care that much harder.

Right now, in my own district, thousands of nurses and healthcare workers are on strike at a hospital owned and operated by the Bon Secours Health System, a \$3.8 billion not-for-profit based in Maryland that owns or manages more than 20 health-related institutions in seven States.

The nurses at St. Vincent hospital are striking on quality of life issues: overtime, mandatory on-call, and, ironically, healthcare for them and their families.

The struggle these workers and these patients are facing is on my mind every minute, and I continue to urge a real dialogue from the company. Go back to the table and bargain to get our nurses back on the job peacefully and productively.

Meanwhile, I urge my colleagues to reauthorize title VIII of the Nursing Workforce Act and amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals.

Finally, Congress must do more to protect and improve DSH payments that help hospitals provide charity care for vulnerable, uninsured patients, so many of whom come into St. Vincent hospital.

**CELEBRATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE**

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate and celebrate the 100th anniversary of the House passage of the 19th Amendment to amend the Constitution to guarantee women the right to vote.

The struggle for women's suffrage was not an easy one, taking over a generation of women fighting to see it through to the end. Women like Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton took a great risk, stepping out of what many thought to be the role of women at the time to argue about the injustice they were facing.

After speeches, petitions, and failed attempts at change, the initial group of women were not able to see their work through to the end but made great strides that enabled future women to finish the job.

On this anniversary, I hope that we will all take the time to remember the hard work that these women had to put in to gain equal voting rights, to remember where our country has been and how we got to where we are today, and to remember that the right for everyone to vote is central to our democracy and a right that we need to continue to protect.

I am grateful for the women who led this effort 100 years ago, and I believe that it is something that should inspire all of us.

**CONTINUE FUNDING ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH**

(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, right now, we face a health crisis.

Alzheimer's disease is a degenerative brain disease and the most common form of dementia; 5.8 million Americans have this disease. One in three seniors dies with Alzheimer's. It is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States of America, and it kills more than breast cancer and prostate cancer combined.

Nancy Reagan called the illness "a truly long, long good-bye."

There are organizations and people working tirelessly on the research being done to fight and prevent these statistics from increasing, but they face three major roadblocks: soaring prevalence, lack of effective treatment, and enormous costs.

The United States and the world face this crisis, and we must continue to support the funding of research for this incredibly devastating disease.

Someday, we will win. Someday, there will be a cure.

**HONORING DANTE TINI**

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, as we head into Memorial Day weekend, I want to honor an American hero who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to our country.

Radioman 3rd Class Dante Tini from Virginia, Minnesota, was stationed aboard the USS Oklahoma in Pearl Harbor on Sunday, December 7, 1941, when torpedoes ripped through the hull of the ship. Thirteen days later, he was declared missing in action. He was just 19 years old.

For 77 years, Dante Tini's family prayed for answers and closure. Just last year, Dante's remains were matched with his family, beginning the process of returning him home.

This Saturday, Dante Tini will be laid to rest next to his parents in his hometown of Virginia, Minnesota, which was his wish when he enlisted.

It was an honor and privilege for my office to help in coordinating this effort, and we look forward to this Saturday when we join his family to welcome him home.

While this Memorial Day is a special day to pay tribute to the fallen, it is important to keep their memory alive and to pay tribute to these special Americans like Dante Tini year-round.

God bless the family of Dante Tini, and I ask for continued prayers for our country.

#### CELEBRATING BICENTENNIAL OF MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, today is the 200th anniversary of the city of Memphis, Tennessee, the city of my birth, where I am a fourth-generation Memphian. I am proud of my city and honored to represent it in the United States Congress.

Memphis is a city that is well known for the National Civil Rights Museum that has turned like a phoenix the site of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King into a shrine for civil rights history and civil rights work in our country.

It is a home of music, Stax Museum of American Soul Music, Sun Records, and Graceland. It is a city of great barbecue, real barbecue, pork. It is a city of basketball, both the Memphis Grizzlies and the Memphis Tigers. And it is a city of marvelous people.

It is a great city. Come celebrate with us the 200th birthday of Memphis, the great city that it is.

#### RECOGNIZING ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, today highlights another success story from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Arizona Public Service, the largest electric utility in Arizona, recently announced that it will again be lowering electricity rates to customers. Arizonans can now expect to save more than \$100 a year on their electricity bill thanks to the Republican-led tax reform package signed by President Trump.

These savings are not crumbs. They are real, and they will benefit millions of people across our State. APS serves about 2.7 million people and operates the Palo Verde Generating Station, which is the largest source of clean-air energy in the United States. The Palo Verde nuclear power plant has 2,500 full-time employees and gen-

erates an economic impact of more than \$2 billion to our State.

Madam Speaker, the 100-degree temperature days are upon us, and I know firsthand how expensive summertime bills can be. This announcement by APS is yet another example of Arizonans winning because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

#### RECOGNIZING HAITIAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the significant cultural and economic contributions the Haitian diaspora has made to America.

The month of May marks Haitian Heritage Month, an expansion of Haitian Flag Day, which is celebrated annually on May 18. As the first Black republic in the world to abolish slavery, the Haitian people continue to demonstrate patriotism, resilience, sacrifice, love, and Haitian pride.

Last weekend, I joined my Haitian brothers and sisters in the Massachusetts Seventh for a Flag Day celebration in Randolph and a Haitian-American Unity Parade in Mattapan. We waved this flag, shouting, "Haiti," and, "Unity is strength," "L'union fait la force."

Massachusetts Seventh is one of the most diverse districts in the country, and the Haitian diaspora is a fundamental part of our district. We have the first-in-the-Nation Haitian-Creole pre-K dual language program at the Toussaint L'Ouverture Academy. We have some of the most influential Haitian leaders in the country, like Marie St. Fleur, Linda Dorcena Forry, Jean Bradley Derenoncourt, Natacha Clerger, and Eunice Zeigler, to name a few.

With many Haitian Americans contributing to our economy and society, they deserve more than TPS renewal. They deserve a pathway to permanent residency. Haitian Americans and the Haitian-American United network have made significant contributions to this country for decades. They are owed residency.

We must continue to affirm the dignity of Haitian Americans and to demand that this administration see their humanity.

#### EMBRACE HISTORY

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, now we have a Democratic Presidential candidate who seems to think that some things named to honor Thomas Jefferson should be renamed, going as far as to say, "It's the right thing to do." Well, maybe he should go back to school and learn about the stunning

impact our Founding Fathers had not only on American history but the history of the world.

To use 21st-century sensibilities to help frame the future may be a good thing, but to use those same sensibilities to judge the past or, worse, to erase parts of our history is simply stupid.

If we measure historical figures and places against a model of perfection, nobody and no nation will ever meet it. We must celebrate the achievements of the past and learn from its mistakes without erasing or rewriting the parts that make 21st-century Americans uncomfortable.

The story of America is the story of progress, of advancement, of always getting better. We should embrace that history in its totality.

#### HONORING FATHER ANGELO CASERTA

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, today, I honor the life of a great man. Born in Piqua, Ohio, Father Angelo Caserta was the oldest active priest in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. He peacefully passed away last week.

Those who knew Father Caserta recall his talent and love for people, his comforting words, and his love for our community.

When asked about the secret to his longevity, Father Caserta said: "My secret is the good Lord. The Lord gets all the credit. I'm the only classmate surviving in my class. Not many average that milestone. . . . It's a celebration of God's goodness, how He could choose someone like me and take care of me for 70 years while doing his work in the priesthood."

On Tuesday, Father Caserta's life was celebrated in Piqua, as he was laid to rest by family and friends.

While I did not know him personally, I knew of his deeds by those who did and the love he had for our community.

Madam Speaker, I use my time on the floor today to honor Father Caserta's life of service, to celebrate his faith, and to extend my condolences to those who knew him.

□ 1745

#### IN HONOR OF JAMES WILKE

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, as we Nebraskans continue to recover as a State from the massive flooding, so many communities hit so hard, so many examples of neighbor helping neighbor, leadership capacity and qualities coming forward, people

pulling together around the ideal of ensuring that the communities have integrity, not of just response, but of recovery, one particular story of heroism has emerged that I would like to share.

Mr. James Wilke, and he is pictured right here, was a farmer. He was a farmer from Columbus, Nebraska, near Columbus in Platte County. Mr. Wilke gave his life during the flood.

What happened is he got a call from volunteer rescuers about someone who was stranded in a car fairly near his farm by a nearby creek. He jumped in his tractor without hesitation—and here he is pictured—and he sought to help the stranded motorists and the volunteers who were there assisting.

When he got to the bridge that was over the creek, water had started to rush over it. The volunteers actually were helping guide him across the creek, and the bridge collapsed. Because he was in an enclosed cab, he couldn't escape.

Frantically, the family and others helped search for him, and it wasn't until hours later that he was found a long way back up the creek, but actually near his home, near his farm. It was as though he was saying, "It's okay. I am back."

I wrote a letter to President Trump recently asking the President to present Mr. James Wilke the Presidential Citizen's Medal, and, Madam Speaker, I would just like to read the letter that I wrote to the President:

"Dear Mr. President,

"It is my honor to nominate Mr. James Wilke of Columbus, Nebraska, for the Presidential Citizen's Medal. The Nation's second highest civilian award recognizes persons who have performed exemplary deeds or services for their country or fellow citizens.

"A 50-year-old Platte County farmer, Mr. Wilke is rightly being heralded as a hero by family, friends, and citizens across the Cornhusker State and the Nation. A husband, father, grandfather, and community leader, James lived to help others. He died attempting to rescue those in need during the catastrophic floods that hit Nebraska in mid-March.

"It surprised no one when, on March 14, James immediately responded to a call from volunteer first responders to help rescue a motorist stranded in the rising floodwaters of Knox Creek near his home. He didn't hesitate. After receiving the call, Wilke jumped into his John Deere 8100 tractor and headed north on Monastery Road, a route he had taken thousands of times before.

"As James approached the scene of the stranded motorist, he was confronted by raging water over the bridge that he needed to cross. Emergency responders already on the site tried to guide James and the tractor over the bridge, when it suddenly collapsed. The tractor plunged into the water with James inside.

"James perished in the accident. After a desperate search by neighbors, family, and friends, Wilke's body was

recovered downstream 9 hours later on a creek bed near his own farm.

"He was generous with his time and giving," said a friend. "... the kind of person that people don't think exist anymore. He would help anybody."

"A friend of Mr. Wilke posted this tribute on social media. 'James was not only a great all-around guy; he was a great family man and he was amazingly strong in his faith. ... A true hero who wore a T-shirt, blue jeans, work boots, and drove a John Deere tractor.'

"An online petition has been launched to get James Wilke the prestigious Presidential Citizen's Medal. One online commentator wrote: 'While I don't know this man personally, he represents what Nebraska is all about: hard work and willingness to help, no matter the cost. To be a Nebraskan means, within your own hardships, you still give your all to help a complete stranger in need. It means coming together to help our neighbors two to three towns over because they have lost everything. James represents a Nebraskan, doing all that and more, by going above and beyond the call of civilian duty and paying the ultimate sacrifice. He shows the Nation that we can put aside our selfishness and our pride to help someone else.'

"Mr. President, I second these sentiments. I strongly support granting the Presidential Citizen's Medal to James Wilke, a good man, simply doing his duty, moved by courage, and motivated by love to help another.

"Thank you for your consideration.

"Sincerely, Jeff Fortenberry."

Something that is not mentioned in this letter is that the online petition to the President for James has reached tens of thousands of people, ordinary people hearing about it and simply wanting to do something to commend this finest example out of what has really been an attribute of the character of our State, neighbor helping neighbor, and this neighbor giving the ultimate sacrifice.

IN HONOR OF CHIEF STANDING BEAR

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to an opportunity I had this morning before the Natural Resources Committee to actually talk about another Nebraskan who lived long ago, a Nebraskan who will soon adorn the Halls here. His statue will be placed in Statuary Hall right outside of these Halls. He was Ponca Chief Standing Bear.

I was pleased to welcome Ms. Judi Gaiashkibos, the director of the Nebraska Indian Commission, who, with me, petitioned the Natural Resources Committee to begin a process by which we study the feasibility of a trail in Standing Bear's honor and in honor of the Ponca people and the hardships which they endured.

I began before the committee this morning with these words:

No be-t e wiuga-the eo kigo zhi: Our hands are not the same color.

These were the words of Chief Standing Bear as he was on trial in 1879.

And what was he accused of in that courtroom in Omaha? He was accused of leaving his reservation to bury his dead son on the Ponca homeland near Niobrara, Nebraska.

Even though there were treaties with this Tribe, the Ponca had been forcefully relocated from Nebraska to Oklahoma. Along the way, his young daughter died. His son, suffering from the ill effects of this, later was very ill, and Chief Standing Bear promised him on his deathbed that he would bury him back in his homeland.

So, leading a group of Ponca in a very tough winter of 1878, they began the trek back to Nebraska, and he was arrested. And through a series of things, ended up in court, and this is what he had to say:

No be-t e wiuga-the eo kigo zhi: Our hands are not the same color. If I pierce mine, I will feel pain. If you pierce your hand, you will feel pain. When the blood flows, it will be the same color.

Nu bthi. Wako da-ak a ekigo waxa: I am a man. God made us the same.

These immortal words of the Ponca chief so deeply impacted the proceedings that the Court ruled in his favor and perhaps began a sea change of change of the history of our country.

Because what did Chief Standing Bear do? He expressed the inherent dignity and rights of all people, regardless of color or ethnicity. He convinced U.S. District Court Judge Elmer Dundy in such a convicting way, he convinced the judge in an unprecedented move—now, remember, Madam Speaker, this is 1879, and this had been unprecedented. The judge ruled that "an Indian is a person." An Indian is a person within the meaning of habeas corpus.

And so Standing Bear had won his right and the right of all Native Americans to be recognized as persons under the law.

Such a glaring injustice is almost unimaginable to us today in our time. The Ponca chief had prevailed in one of the most important civil rights court cases in the history of our Nation.

And so, in Congress, we continue to recognize Standing Bear's remarkable life and achievement on behalf of his people; and, as I mentioned, Madam Speaker, in a few short months, we anticipate a ceremony here in Statuary Hall where one statue of one Nebraskan will be replaced by another Nebraskan.

Each State legislature has the right to determine who is going to be in the Nation's Capitol. Currently, we are represented by William Jennings Bryan, a Member of Congress who held this congressional seat long before me, a three-time Presidential candidate who, again, is right at the entryway of Statuary Hall there.

He has held that revered spot for many, many years; and yet, as we think creatively and imaginatively, as history moves forward, we think about other Nebraskans and other Americans whom we can appropriately honor. So

the legislature has determined that Chief Standing Bear ought to now stand in the place of honor for Nebraskans and for all Americans, with a particularly special focal point for honoring the first Americans, the indigenous people, the Native Americans. So we look forward to that ceremony coming soon.

But I reintroduced a bill, as well, Madam Speaker, that directs the Secretary of the Interior to begin a feasibility study for the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, which would basically trace the footsteps of the Ponca Tribe along their forced relocation.

Again, Madam Speaker, the enshrinement of this trial into law with a new statue in the United States Capitol will set down a new marker for the remembrance of this great civil rights leader, a reminder of the ongoing need for the protection of human dignity and a celebration of the possibility brought out by one man's courage.

Madam Speaker, as you are aware, shortly, we will celebrate Memorial Day, and in doing so, we honor those who gave their last full measure in service to our country. We appropriately stop the busyness and pause to observe, to reflect, to remember.

The formal remembrance of our Nation's war dead is more than a nostalgic tradition. That a person would lay down his life for his friends, for another, demands that we turn our thoughts to the noblest of human ideals. When we gather together in community, when we gather together to simply say "thank you" and "remember," we affirm our common bonds as a people.

Now, it is not uncommon for any Member of this body to reflect publicly on the divisiveness, the anger, the resentment, the seeming inability to resolve conflicts and problems in a constructive, reasoned fashion that is fought out in this body, and, unfortunately, is exploited by the media, which profits off of this drama daily.

□ 1800

This is why Memorial Day and other reflective holidays are so important to us as a people: of course, to remember our war dead, but also to affirm the common bonds that unite.

Before an international gathering of public officials that I attended, someone posed a question. It is a probing question. They simply asked this: Where would you like to live, where people lie, steal, and kill, or where people are good, trustworthy, and free?

And when we consider the full arc of human history, it is often marked by fighting and dying and war. Each generation must face the agonizing and harsh prospect that twisted ideology, egomaniacal ambition, or the hunt for glory will compel small minds to rape and kill and pillage and crush the innocent. Try as we might to create the conditions for good will and mutual

support, sometimes good Americans must step forward; they must volunteer to bravely protect the ideals that we hold dear.

We are coming up on the 75th anniversary of D-day, June 6, 1944. There will be a bilateral, two-country commemoration by both America and France at Omaha Beach in France at the cemetery there where near approximately 10,000 Americans lay at rest.

The night before D-day, the day before this famous photo of the Supreme Allied Commander Dwight Eisenhower was taken—I happen to know President Eisenhower's granddaughter Susan, and we were chatting one day about this famous photo which occupies such an extraordinary place in our history, our folklore, our memory as a nation, and she said: Jeff, do you know what the President, the General, was speaking about in that photo?

I had always made an assumption that, again, these young men who are getting ready to paratroop behind enemy lines the day before D-day were being given a last talk by the General about the need for courage and persistence, the need to think of what it means to be in the face of a barbaric aggressor, the need to fight hard and solemnly, to obey orders and to take care of their friends, the need to win the day. That is what I would have thought. That is what I would have guessed.

Susan Eisenhower said: No. Do you know what the General was speaking about? Fly fishing and football.

Now, why would he do that at this critical moment, this moment of tension and fear and adrenaline? Why would he do that?

I think the better question is: Why wouldn't he do that? What more American thing could he do to remind these young men, many of whom may have given their life, of why they were doing this? To remind them of what they were tethered to: to home and hearth and things like fishing and football that represent the activities of community, the liberties we enjoy, the memories from childhood, the peace and tranquility that this country offers. Fight for that.

I think that is what he was doing. So I was very amazed and corrected, mentally, in my impression of this pivotal moment, key moment in America's history.

A group of Members of Congress will attend the 75th anniversary, and, of course, the veterans who will be there in attendance are quite old and will be few in number. France will have some awards for a few veterans as well.

And it is amazing in that part of the world, the American flag flies over the French municipal buildings there because the French in that part of Europe, they do not forget. They celebrate what America gave.

In fact, in August of 1944, Captain Luther Sexton Fortenberry, my grandfather, left his wife and two children, and he entered the war theater origi-

nally attached to a field hospital or to a hospital unit in England.

He moved into the theater of war and was killed in November of 1944 by an explosion. He was killed near the town of Sainte-Mere-Eglise, where some of these paratroopers potentially landed. There, the paratroopers landed in the midst of a German column and had to fight it out right in the town square.

To this day, a replica of one of our paratroopers hangs on the church steeple, demonstrating what happened to him. He was actually caught on the church steeple as he came down. He survived the battle. The French there very much commemorate and honor what we gave.

My grandfather was initially buried in the cemetery there at Sainte-Mere-Eglise, but was later reinterred in Arlington Cemetery here in Washington, D.C., in 1948. This is how Omaha Cemetery came to be.

All of the small cemeteries that were set up during the course of the war as things were moving so fast were consolidated in the various large cemeteries—again, Omaha Beach being one of our more notable—and families were given a choice: Do you want to leave your loved one in Europe or would you like to bring them home?

Because my own father died when I was young, the direct memories of what happened to my own grandfather are a bit lost in the family tradition, so I have had to do a lot of record searching. I found out, though, that it was interesting. In 1948, when my grandfather was reinterred from this area of France, Sainte-Mere-Eglise, his remains were transported through the Port of Cherbourg.

When I visited Omaha Beach Cemetery, the French civilians who work for us tending to the cemetery remembering our war dead, telling the stories of who they are, one young woman told me that it was her grandfather who started to work for the Americans in burying our war dead and that he used to work in the Port of Cherbourg preparing the remains of our war dead to come home. I thought to myself, what an amazing confluence of history, that maybe it was this young French woman's grandfather who prepared my grandfather to be returned home.

So on the 75th anniversary, we will again remember that great battle, that turning point in the war in which so many lives were lost and so many young Americans came forward to say, "I will serve."

Memorial Day is a beautiful time of remembrance, and communities all across America will recognize this special day. They will memorialize the fallen heroes of battle who gave us the chance to remain good, trustworthy, and free. It is a precious moment where we unite, where we are unified, where we hold things in common in gratitude for those who gave their life in service to these ideals.

Beyond this special day, perhaps the greatest memorial we can offer is to do

exactly what they did: to think in sacrificial terms about what is nobler and higher, even in the midst of this body, where we have to debate with intensity the philosophical differences in order to find, to construct, a reasoned way forward for good public policy and the good of all Americans.

Sometimes young people ask me: How do you make a decision? It is a great question. It is a beautiful question, because they are wrestling with how do you reconcile, as a representative of the people, what you may believe to be right with what the people are saying.

Madam Speaker, I tell young people that I walk through a threefold process:

The first is let's look at the evidence here. What is the analysis, the statistics, and what does other evidence say about what might be the right pathway here;

Second, let's listen to the experts, or those who are affected, potentially, by this policy; and

Third is you must consult your conscience, what you believe in your heart of hearts.

Sometimes it is hard for young people to reconcile this because sometimes we have a misappropriation of the nature of representative government. The Representative, of course, is a reflection of the people who sent him there.

And what does he or she owe those people? Right judgment, which means hard work and intellectual discipline around looking at the objective analysis of what can be determined as the outcome of a particular policy.

Care, compassion, and fairness demands that we listen to people who are affected or who have expertise in the policy.

But, ultimately, each one of us has to consult their conscience, always, hopefully, rightfully formed, to make a judgment about what is right, what is good, what is just.

The beautiful gift of where I come from is, even if people may disagree and you give them an answer based upon those three dynamics, they will tell you they respect that. And that is the core of our system. That is what men and women continue to fight and die for, this gift of America, this gift of these ideals that somehow, with distinct differences and different backgrounds, we find a way to harmonize that which we ought to do—not just what we can do, but what we ought to do.

Systems are not perfect. They can be messy and difficult. They can be ugly. But I always believe that public service is an honorable and high calling, and it is only made possible by sacrifice, sometimes the ultimate sacrifice by those who have been willing to give their all.

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

## WOMEN'S ACCESS TO ESSENTIAL HEALTHCARE SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss women's access to essential healthcare services.

I am the mother of three beautiful children. When I gave birth to my first child, to my second child, and to my third child, I was given the time and opportunity to plan for these pregnancies and welcome these children. I was privileged enough to have the ability to make an informed decision to become a mother at a time in my life when I was ready to care for children.

Prior to having children, I had access to birth control. I received healthcare that helped me have three healthy pregnancies and helped me to be able to get pregnant when I was ready. But too many women in this country don't have these choices.

Across the world, maternal mortality rates are decreasing. Pregnancy and birth are less dangerous across the globe, but not in the United States. While our country is a leader in so many ways, we are failing our Nation's women by not delivering the care they need during and after they give birth.

Too many women don't have access to prenatal and postnatal care. Too many women already don't have access to birth control or abortion services, and if we do not fight back, this crisis is only going to get worse. If we do not fight back, women are going to die.

The bills currently passing at the State level will not stop abortion. Overturning *Roe v. Wade* will not stop abortion. These acts will only stop safe abortion.

Research has found that every year approximately 25.1 million women receive an unsafe abortion, and 68,000 women die annually of bleeding and infection, almost entirely in countries where abortion is illegal or inaccessible.

If we continue down this road, women will die. The laws being passed in Alabama, Missouri, and Georgia are not pro-life. They are not protecting the lives of women and families that we were elected to serve.

Alabama has one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the country, but instead of focusing on ensuring that women have access to the healthcare services they need when they choose to have a pregnancy, the State is choosing to punish those who do not become mothers.

□ 1815

Alabama State legislature has said that they just simply don't have the funds to expand Medicaid to cover more low-income women, families, and other individuals. Yet they have the millions of dollars necessary to fight a legal battle to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

These laws are anti-choice, anti-women, and anti-life.

In the Alabama bill, the penalty for aborting a pregnancy caused by rape is higher than the penalty for raping a woman. Let me say it again: in the Alabama law, the penalty for aborting a pregnancy caused by rape is higher than the penalty for committing the rape.

This is not the country we want to be.

How is that upholding our values?

Let's also note that women who have a miscarriage—a tragic event—could be criminally investigated to determine if the miscarriage was related to an attempted abortion or was otherwise somehow the fault of the woman.

According to March of Dimes, 10 to 15 percent of pregnancies end in miscarriage. Most miscarriages happen in the first trimester, before the 12th week of pregnancy, but nearly 5 percent of pregnancies that ended with miscarriages happened in the second trimester.

As a mother I cannot imagine the pain of losing a child in the first, second, or even third trimester. For those who choose to get pregnant, this loss is devastating. Imagine you and your partner try for years to get pregnant. You can't afford expensive treatments like IVF because they are not covered under your insurance. You desperately want to be a mother, but nothing seems to be working. Finally, after 3 years, you take a home pregnancy test, and you find out you are pregnant. A short trip to the doctor confirms this incredible and exciting news. You and your partner are overjoyed. But 5 months later you start bleeding and rush to the emergency room. More than halfway through your pregnancy, you have miscarried and will now have to deliver a stillborn child. You and your partner are heartbroken.

Imagine that a few days after this tragic loss you find out that you and your doctor are both being investigated for attempting to abort the child whose death you are still mourning.

This is cruel and inhumane. These bills are not intended to stop abortion, and they will not stop abortion. They are not intended to save lives, and, in fact, these bills will take lives.

This is the proof. If we really want to reduce the number of abortions in this country, we must ensure safe access to women's healthcare, including birth control and comprehensive family planning options.

I want women in Alabama, in Georgia, in Missouri, and in every State across the country that has passed or is attempting to pass legislation to challenge *Roe v. Wade* to know that I stand with them.

I want women in Orange County to know that they elected someone who will fight for their access to essential healthcare services.

I want women in California and across the country to trust that my colleagues and I will fight for women

to have the healthcare and the respect that they need and deserve regardless of their income, race, or location.

Protecting women's access to healthcare is one of my top priorities, and I will fight to ensure that every woman has the access they need to live a healthy life on their own terms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defy the horrifying attacks happening against women's reproductive rights all across this country.

Religious fundamentalists are currently trying to manipulate the State laws in order to impose their beliefs on an entire society, all with complete disregard for voices and the rights of American women.

The recent efforts like those in Alabama and Georgia are only the latest in a long history of efforts to criminalize women for simply existing and to punish us when we don't conform to their attempts to control us. And a new proposal in Texas would go as far as to threaten women who obtain an abortion with capital punishment.

If that were being proposed by any other country, we would be calling it a dangerous violation of human rights. But because it is happening here with the support of the ultraconservative religious right, we call it religious freedom. It is simply unthinkable.

But this anti-choice movement isn't only unjust, it is dangerous because history has proven that when abortion is criminalized, the number of abortions do not simply go down. The number of deaths and injuries to women increase.

Let's just be honest. For the religious right, this isn't simply about their care or concern for life. If they cared about or were concerned about children, then they would be concerned about the children who are being detained and those who are dying in camps across our borders or the children who are languishing in hunger and facing homelessness.

This isn't about religious morality or conviction, because we have seen time and time again those who talk about their faith and want to push policies because of their faith are the ones who simply are caught with the hypocrisy of not living it out in their personal lives.

I just remember recently, not too long ago, a Republican Congressman who had to retire, Tim Murphy, because he asked his mistress to abort their baby while pushing for a ban on abortion. Or I remember the anti-LGBT rights Republican, Larry Craig, who was found soliciting sex in a bathroom in a Minneapolis airport.

I am frustrated every single time I hear people speaking about their faith and pushing that on to other people, because we know those so-called religious politicians, when it comes to their life and their choices, they want to talk about freedom, but when it comes to other people's lives and other

people's choices, then they want to talk about religion.

I feel that we must point out how ironic it is that women now are facing these challenges to their freedom in the week that we are marking the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment.

How can it be that an entire century has passed, and we are still forced to fight for our rights as women, as human beings, and as Americans?

This should outrage every single person. It certainly outrages me, and we can no longer stand for it.

So today I ask every woman in this country no matter her age, her race, or her political affiliation to stand with me—to stand with us—to stand up and tell those who challenge our voice, our place, and our right to decide for ourselves to not be silent, to speak up and to reclaim their right to choose.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative OMAR for her remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of Ohio National Guard Duty.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 23, 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:

1075. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Missoula PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0235; FRL-9993-66-Region 8] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1076. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Revisions to Particulate Matter Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0384; FRL-9994-12-Region 5] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1077. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; NC; Permitting Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0454;

FRL-9993-97-Region 4] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1078. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Nonattainment New Source Review Program Revisions; Infrastructure Provisions for National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0829; FRL-9993-84-Region 1] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1079. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Process Operations [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0609; FRL-9993-90-Region 4] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1080. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Volatile Organic Liquid Storage Tank Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0625; FRL-9994-10-Region 5] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1081. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0842; FRL-9994-11-Region 5] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1082. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA; Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2006-0651; FRL-9994-14-Region 4] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1083. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Permit Exemption for Fire Fighting Equipment [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0064; FRL-9993-89-Region 4] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1084. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0572; FRL-9992-69] received May 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 Energy and Commerce.

1085. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule; NOx Ozone Season Group 2, NOx Annual, and SO2 Group 1 Trading Program, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.



1086. A letter from the Assistant Director, OSD SEMO, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of a vacancy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1087. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1088. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1089. A letter from the Director, Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting five (5) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1090. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1091. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a notification of a vacancy and a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1092. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director (OMA), Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting nine (9) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 2888. A bill to explicitly make unauthorized access to Department of Education information technology systems and the misuse of identification devices issued by the Department of Education a criminal act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2889. A bill to direct the Attorney General to acquire data, for each calendar year, about sexual offenses, including rape, that occur aboard any mode of transportation over which the Federal Government exercises jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 2890. A bill to provide penalties for countries that systematically and unreasonably refuse or delay repatriation of certain nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition

to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2891. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 2892. A bill to authorize scholarships to assist members of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps in obtaining private pilot's certificates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUDA (for himself and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 2893. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit causing the beam of a laser pointer to strike a vessel operating on the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2894. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for State and local taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. BACON, and Ms. FINKENAUER):

H.R. 2895. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs.

BUSTOS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. HILL of California):

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that it is unlawful to knowingly distribute private intimate visual depictions with reckless disregard for the individual's lack of consent to the distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI,

Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MAST, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. DEAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 2897. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the adoption or non-laboratory placement of certain animals used in Federal research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms.

BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KATKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 2898. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate a week as "Buddy Check Week" for the purpose of outreach and education concerning peer wellness checks for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 2899. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 2900. A bill to establish the United States Chief Manufacturing Officer in the Executive Office of the President with the responsibility of developing a National Manufacturing Strategy to revitalize the manufacturing sector, spur economic growth, and expand United States competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. WILD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2901. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to improve the Social Security Administration's procedures to close or reduce access to field offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 2902. A bill to support States in their work to end preventable morbidity and mortality in maternity care by using evidence-based quality improvement to protect the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period and to reduce neonatal and infant mortality, to eliminate racial disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the International Stock Index Investment Fund of the Thrift Savings Fund from investing in any entity in peer or near-peer competitor nations as outlined in the National Defense Strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2904. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to extend certain supervisory authority of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to include assessing compliance with the Military Lending Act; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2905. A bill to provide for a demonstration project to further examine the benefits of providing coverage and payment for items and services necessary to administer intravenous immune globulin (IVIG) in the home, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2906. A bill to reauthorize the Clean School Bus Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2907. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2908. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BACON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2909. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, a demonstration program, and a technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 2910. A bill to provide that an order by the Secretary of the Interior imposing a moratorium on Federal coal leasing shall not take effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2911. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 2912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 2913. A bill to promote security and energy partnerships in the Eastern Mediterranean, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 2914. A bill to make available necessary disaster assistance for families affected by major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2915. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require physicians and physician's offices to be treated as covered device users required to report on certain adverse events involving medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 2916. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide hospital care and medical services to veterans in the Freely Associated States of the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia, and to conduct a study on the feasibility and advisability of establishing regional offices, suboffices, contact units, or other subordinate offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs in the Freely Associated States to provide such care and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 2917. A bill to hold pharmaceutical companies accountable for dubious marketing and distribution of opioid products and for their role in creating and exacerbating the opioid epidemic in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SABLON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2918. A bill to create dedicated funds to conserve butterflies in North America, plants in the Pacific Islands, freshwater mussels in the United States, and desert fish in the Southwest United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself and Mr. MCADAMS):

H.R. 2919. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study to evaluate the issues affecting the provision of and reliance upon investment research into small issuers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2920. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to consumers to reimburse a portion of the cost of broadband infrastructure serving limited broadband districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. TRONE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHES-TER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CROW, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2922. A bill to address the opioid epidemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, the Budget, 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 Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2923. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2924. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reauthorize the Supportive Services for Veteran Families Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2925. A bill to ensure the digital contents of electronic equipment and online accounts belonging to or in the possession of United States persons entering or exiting the United States are adequately protected at the border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2926. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to adjust certain standards for shipping safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 2927. A bill to require that States and localities receiving grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program require law enforcement officers to undergo training on and thereafter employ de-escalation techniques to assist in reducing the need for the use of force by such officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail, and at-risk individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 2929. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a program to promote the availability and sustainability of robust rural broadband networks in high cost rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms.

PRESSLEY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 2930. A bill to protect consumers from usury; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care for certain individuals discharged from service in the Armed Forces by reason of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2932. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the needs of children are considered in homeland security planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2933. A bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, and to establish a commission to review large agriculture, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, concentration, and market power; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 2934. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the use of educational assistance under chapter 33 of that title to pay for preparatory courses for professional licenses and certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

H.R. 2935. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2936. A bill to provide disaster relief to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide compensation and credit for retired pay purposes for maternity leave taken by members of the reserve components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all trade agreements the United States enters into, should provide reasonable access and collaboration of each nation involved in such an agreement, for the purpose of search and recovery activities relating to members of the United States Armed Forces missing in action from prior wars or military conflicts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution recognizing the honorable service of military working dogs and soldier handlers in the tactical explosive detection dog program of the Army and encouraging the Army and other government agencies, including law enforcement agencies, with former tactical explosive detection dogs to prioritize adoption of the dogs to former tactical explosive detection dog handlers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GAETZ, and Mrs. LESKO):

H. Res. 394. A resolution recognizing the 36th anniversary of National Missing Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H. Res. 395. A resolution condemning the senseless attacks on hospitals and medical personnel in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Res. 396. A resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise the power vested by Article 1, Section 2, Clause 5 of the Constitution in respect to acts of misconduct by Donald John Trump, President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H. Res. 397. A resolution recognizing the challenges, achievements, and significant contributions of women and minorities in the fields of housing, housing finance, and community development; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YOH, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STEWART, Mr.

GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ESTES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. DUNN):

H. Res. 398. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Green New Deal is antithetical to the principles of free market capitalism and private property rights, is simply a thinly veiled attempt to usher in policies that create a socialist society in America, and is impossible to fully implement; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 399. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of International Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 2888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma:

H.R. 2892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 12 provides Congress with the power to raise and support armies. Article I, Section 8, clause 13 provides Congress with the power to "provide and maintain" a navy.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 2893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitution of the United States, Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (Commerce Clause); and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2900.

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.”

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 8

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 2903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States)

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. Article 1, Section 1.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states 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. CASE:

H.R. 2908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 2909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 2910.

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. COOK:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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 Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One Of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United State Constitution including Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United State Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The “necessary and proper” clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2923.

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 Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 2925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." [Page H473]

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 2937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 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. 40: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 96: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 98: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 141: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 158: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 296: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 307: Mr. SPANO and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 336: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROY, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 372: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 500: Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. DEAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. GALLEGGO, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 510: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OLSON, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 526: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 550: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MAST, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 553: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 554: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 555: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 562: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 584: Mr. KIND, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 587: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 598: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 661: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 663: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 693: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 748: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 808: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 838: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 877: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 890: Mr. POSSEY.

H.R. 913: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 924: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLEGGO, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 929: Mr. KATKO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 935: Mr. VISCOSKY.

H.R. 940: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 943: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DEFazio, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 945: Mr. GALLEGGO.

H.R. 948: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 996: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1004: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1007: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1024: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1025: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1032: Mr. CRIST, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1042: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 1046: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1058: Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1078: Mr. REED and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1108: Mr. ROUZER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. PORTER, Mr. HECK, and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1128: Mrs. CRAIG and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1166: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1175: Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. KIM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1179: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1197: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 1230: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1236: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1237: Mr. HECK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1244: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1256: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1275: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1309: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1317: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SIREs, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1327: Ms. MOORE, Mr. VELA, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1358: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1365: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1370: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1373: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1406: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1423: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1444: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1446: Mr. PETERS and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1497: Mr. BEYER, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 1530: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1556: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1570: Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. KATKO, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1575: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1579: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1597: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROUDA, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1610: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1622: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1641: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1679: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1696: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1713: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1716: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1748: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1766: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1770: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 1773: Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1804: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 1830: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1850: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 1862: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1869: Mr. BEYER and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1872: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1896: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. BACON, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1897: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1904: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 1921: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1941: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1942: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1945: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1948: Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1956: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1959: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1965: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1968: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. VELA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COSTA, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1980: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1982: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2011: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2013: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2079: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2091: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2113: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2126: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2147: Mr. WELCH, Mr. SPANO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GOLDEN, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2148: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2149: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 2150: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2164: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2207: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2218: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2219: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 2235: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2245: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2249: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2258: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2314: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2329: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2377: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2411: Mr. MARCHANT and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2441: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2447: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2452: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2481: Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2489: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROW, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2493: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 2504: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2508: Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 2513: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2531: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2537: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2538: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 2561: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2576: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2577: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2585: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2615: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2617: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2620: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2622: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2633: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2637: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2639: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2646: Ms. NORTON, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2648: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 2649: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2681: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2684: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2698: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2708: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2742: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2747: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 2775: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2777: Mr. SIREs, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2790: Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2801: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2802: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2803: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2805: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2808: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2813: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2819: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2829: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 2846: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 2861: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 2878: Mr. WRIGHT.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. FUDGE.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BERA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. WILD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CRIST, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms.

JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 27: Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 33: Ms. OMAR, Mr. REED, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LAHOOD, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 54: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COMER, and Ms. SHALALA.

H. Res. 60: Mr. SIREs.

H. Res. 107: Mr. CORREA.

H. Res. 165: Mr. BERA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H. Res. 230: Mrs. TRAHAN and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H. Res. 285: Mr. COOK, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GHANFORTE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KIND, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H. Res. 317: Mr. MOULTON.

H. Res. 340: Mr. VEASEY and Mrs. CRAIG.

H. Res. 350: Mr. PALMER.

H. Res. 372: Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 374: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 383: Mr. SPANO.

H. Res. 391: Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 393: Mr. YOHO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Ms. DELAURO.





United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2019

No. 86

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARSHA BLACKBURN, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, supply the needs of our Senators. Meet them with new insights for the good of our Nation and world. Lord, provide them with fresh strength so they will not become weary in doing what is right. Give them the long view of their work. Inspire them with the vibrant belief that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail. Strengthen them this day with the positive assurance of Your eternal presence.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, May 22, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARSHA BLACKBURN, a

Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
President pro tempore.

Mrs. BLACKBURN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### S. 1541

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on Monday, I introduced legislation to raise the national minimum age for purchasing tobacco products from 18 to 21. I walked through the long history of our Nation's complicated relationship with this major cash crop. I laid out the challenges facing tobacco farmers in Kentucky and in other States and the new opportunities some of them are actually turning to. I explained why, as we see signs of a new public health crisis of nicotine addiction in the younger generation, now is the time to take decisive new action.

Together with Senator TIM KAINE, who represents another State with a very long history of tobacco production, I was proud to introduce the bill that builds on the existing structure that is already in place and simply raises the minimum age to 21. Rather than reinvent the wheel here in Washington, it would set one national standard for enforcing new age-21 restrictions. It is a bill designed with States in mind, and it would allow States to take measures even more restrictive than Federal law if they choose.

Senator KAINE and I have been grateful to see—already, even in just the past few days—substantial support and recognition from public health advocates that our approach is the right way to address this pressing issue.

Already, our legislation has earned the support of leading voices like the American Cancer Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Cardiology, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky, the Kentucky Hospital and Medical Associations, and many others. Here are just a few things these supporters of our bill had to say:

One advocate called it a “critical step forward that will profoundly improve the health of our children and future generations.”

Another stated our legislation “will be instrumental in stemming the epidemic of vaping that is afflicting children as young as middle school.”

Yet another said our bill could potentially “save hundreds of thousands of lives.”

This should be an area where we all lock arms to get results. I am proud this body will have a chance to take action and stem the tide of addiction among our Nation's youth. I am proud to be standing with Senator KAINE. I hope each of our colleagues will recognize the opportunity before us, avoid making this important issue any kind of partisan football, and join in supporting the Tobacco-Free Youth Act.

### NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, since President Trump took office in 2017, the Senate has confirmed 41 well-qualified individuals to serve on our Nation's circuit courts. No. 41 was Daniel Collins of California, whom we confirmed yesterday to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. As I have noted already, Mr. Collins came before the Senate with every conceivable indicator of a brilliant legal mind and an impeccable professional record. I was proud that the full Senate followed up

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3017

the Judiciary Committee's favorable report with a majority vote here on the floor.

But our work this week is just beginning. Yesterday, the Senate also advanced four more nominees—these to serve on district courts across the country. Today, we will vote to confirm all four.

The first, Howard Nielson, has been nominated for the District of Utah. As I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Nielson has clerked for both the Fourth Circuit and the Supreme Court and has assembled an impressive record at the Department of Justice and in the private sector.

Next will come the nomination of Stephen Clark for the Eastern District of Missouri. Mr. Clark is an accomplished litigator with nearly three decades of experience in practice.

The third nominee is Carl Nichols, the President's choice to serve as district judge for the District of Columbia. You will start to detect a pattern because he, too, is a thoroughly impressive nominee—clerkships for the DC Circuit and for the Supreme Court for Justice Thomas, service at the Department of Justice, and recognized excellence in private practice.

Finally, we will vote on Kenneth Bell, nominated to serve in the Western District of North Carolina. Mr. Bell has under his belt nearly two decades of service in the Office of the U.S. Attorney—distinguished by national honors for his accomplishments as a prosecutor—as well as extensive experience in the private sector.

So if I am sounding like a broken record, it is because the White House continues to submit one extremely well-qualified and highly impressive nominee after another to sit on the Federal bench. These are men and women who are bright, talented, well-regarded, and committed to applying what the text of our laws and our Constitution actually say.

Today, we can take four more steps in that positive direction. These nominees deserve big bipartisan votes, so I hope each of my colleagues will join me in voting to confirm each of them.

#### DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on one final matter, several of our Senate colleagues and their counterparts in the House are continuing to zero in on long-overdue legislation to deliver additional help to Americans all across the Nation who are struggling to rebuild from natural disasters. This ought to have been a fairly straightforward process. We shouldn't need to explain why the need for this relief is urgent, but just for good measure, let's remember the Americans who are counting on us.

In California, last year's string of wildfires included the deadliest and most destructive fire on record. It killed 85 people and burned more than 150,000 acres.

In the Midwest earlier this year, storm surges flooded whole swaths of States and racked up millions of dollars in damages. As one expert recently put it, "We have points in Iowa and Illinois that have been in flood stage for over 30 days"—30 days—"which hasn't occurred since we started keeping records—and some of them go back 150 years."

Across the Southeast and gulf coasts, recent hurricane seasons have left lasting scars. Hurricane Michael, which swept across Florida into South Georgia last October, has itself produced nearly 150,000 insurance claims in Florida alone.

In Alabama, more tornadoes have already been recorded in 2019 than in all of last year. One that touched down in Lee County on March 3 left 23 people dead.

Nearly 2 years after Hurricane Maria tore across Puerto Rico, too many storefronts are still shuttered, too many homes still lack roofs, and power remains too unreliable.

And the list goes on.

This is hardly the first time facts like these have been laid out here on the floor. In fact, this legislation has already taken far too long—far too long—to deliver. But now that we are in the home stretch, it is past time to put partisan politics aside, move past any tangential questions, and secure a final agreement that can become law; that is, something that can both pass the Democratic House and earn the President's signature soon. That is how to make a law in this situation.

The Senate will vote on disaster relief this week. The Members of this body will not return home for Memorial Day without taking further action to help these struggling communities, which, by the way, include a number of military installations that need assistance to recover and to rebuild.

It is my sincere hope that we will be able to vote on a negotiated, bipartisan, bicameral solution. That is how we can get to an outcome. That is what affected Americans deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, it has been a frightening 2 weeks for tens of millions of Americans who support a

woman's freedom to make her own healthcare choices. Actually, if you believe the polls, there are hundreds of millions of Americans in that category.

Republican legislators across the country have passed some of the most extreme restrictions on a woman's right to choose. With breathtaking speed, they are trying to take us backward, but they have already provoked a fierce reaction among the American people.

Just yesterday, I stood with hundreds before the Supreme Court to speak on behalf of Americans everywhere who believe that women don't deserve to be treated this way by their government. Meanwhile, here in the Senate, the Republican leader is once again stalling—it seems to be his MO—on a bill to improve legal protections for women who are victims of domestic abuse, assault, and stalking. This is VAWA, or the Violence Against Women Act.

VAWA has been a landmark piece of legislation, and it has greatly reduced the abuse of women. Well, there was an improved and expanded VAWA that was passed by the House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis. It got significant Republican votes. It brings much needed updates to existing Federal law. It finally expands protections to women who are victims of violence from domestic partners or former partners, not just current or former spouses. It also says that if you are known to stalk your partner or have a restraining order against you, you shouldn't be allowed to purchase a gun. Thanks to the work of some of my colleagues in both Chambers, it also brings renewed attention to violence against Native American women who are so often overlooked.

I thank Senators SMITH, KLOBUCHAR, and CANTWELL for bringing attention to this bill later today.

Unfortunately, Leader MCCONNELL has indicated that he will not bring the House-passed VAWA bill to the floor, despite these many commonsense reforms. Why not? I hope it is not because the gun lobby reflexively opposes any restrictions on gun purchases—even for convicted stalkers. I hope that is not the impediment here, because as Senator KLOBUCHAR has pointed out, if you are abused by your husband, then, you are protected by VAWA. If you are abused by a boyfriend, you are not. What is the difference? What is the difference?

VAWA is yet another example of how Leader MCCONNELL has turned this Chamber into a legislative graveyard. Even the most commonsense bills, with broad support from one end of America to the other, that are passed by the House—here, a bill protecting women from violence—meet the grim fate at the hands of the Senate's self-proclaimed Grim Reaper.

What a shame. The Violence Against Women Act is precisely the kind of legislation the American people expect the Senate to consider. During a difficult few weeks for women across

America, the Senate could have sent a strong, positive signal by moving forward on the Violence Against Women Act. Instead, Leader McConnell carved out another tombstone for his legislative graveyard—another popular bipartisan bill buried with no action by the Senate and tied by the leader in partisan gridlock.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, earlier this month, a report from Hawaii's Mauna Loa Observatory found that carbon dioxide levels in our atmosphere have now reached the highest level in human history—in human history. It was a chilling reminder that the threat from climate change is real, immediate, and existential. Almost everyone accepts this science and the gravity of the threat it portends. The only group of folks that still seem skeptical of climate science are Republicans and the Trump administration.

Yesterday the New York Times reported that the Trump EPA is planning to rewrite the established benchmarks for unsafe levels of air pollution. You heard that right. They are planning to use dubious math to obscure the real and long-known health risks of air pollution. These new formulations would result in fewer predicted deaths than what the experts have long agreed to. People will still die. The numbers will just be wrong about the effect.

Why, might you ask, would anyone want to obscure the full health risks of air pollution? Because then the Trump administration could use the fake math to justify further rollbacks to clean air rules at a time when global warming is increasing and when Americans know the danger. This Trump administration and the Republican majority are rolling the clock back—more carbon, more coal, more oil, and more gas, when we need less. We all know that.

What kind of Orwellian nonsense is this? The Environmental Protection Agency making it easier to pollute the environment? It is a textbook definition of “dystopian.”

As my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE so often points out, dark money lurks behind so much of what the Trump administration does. Big Oil, Big Gas, and big polluters everywhere are the only possible boosters of this decision. It is their money, funneled to political organizations and politicians without a trace of disclosure, that motivates folks in the Trump administration to make it easier to release more pollution into the air.

We should be using the Senate to debate climate policies in search of common ground, but Leader McConnell has decided to bring forward his version of the Green New Deal just so his party could vote against it. We know what Leader McConnell and the Republicans are against. What are they for in dealing with climate change? So far, nada, zero, nothing—they haven't

put a single thing on the floor. The American people see the effects of climate change in their lives, and they know Congress must act. Only the Republican majority stands in the way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 (Mr. ROMNEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard C. Nielson, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah.

#### MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Monday is Memorial Day. It is the day our Nation pauses to remember all those who laid down their lives in defense of our country, from Saratoga to Yorktown, to Iraq and Afghanistan.

We enjoy tremendous freedoms as Americans, tremendous privileges, but we do not enjoy these privileges by chance. They are hard-fought gains secured for us again and again by each new generation of American soldiers who lay down their lives in the cause of the free. It is important that we do not take what they have secured for us lightly, that we remember our freedoms have been paid for in blood.

Near the end of the film “Saving Private Ryan,” the dying Captain Miller tells Private Ryan of the sacrifice that has been made on his behalf. He says: “Earn this . . . earn it.”

I am not sure we can ever fully earn the gift that has been given to us by those who have laid down their lives in our defense, but we can attempt to live lives worthy of their sacrifice and to defend the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

When we remember the fallen on Memorial Day, there is one other group we should remember, and that is their

families. Our Nation's Gold Star families may not have laid down their own lives for our country, but they gave their loved ones, their fathers and brothers, daughters and sisters. For the sake of our freedoms, they live with empty spaces at Thanksgivings and birthdays, at weddings and graduations, at their dinner tables and Little League practices. We owe them a debt also that we can never repay.

I have been privileged to visit more than one veterans cemetery, such as our own Black Hills National Cemetery in South Dakota—which we recently expanded to ensure that our soldiers will have a resting place for generations to come—Arlington National Cemetery, and the American Cemetery at Normandy. There is a special hallowedness to the ground at these places. Valor and sacrifice still linger in the air, and a deep peace abounds—the peace of the warrior who has fought the good fight and found rest from his labors.

General George S. Patton once said:

It is foolish and wrong to mourn the men who died. Rather, we should thank God that such men lived.

I might disagree with General Patton on the first part, as it is right and proper that we should mourn our dead, but with General Patton, I say: Let us thank God that such men and women lived.

May the memory of our honored dead be eternal.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor again today to discuss Washington Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme. Every American needs to know about this very radical plan.

Democrats essentially want Washington, DC, to take over all of healthcare in this country and to abolish private health insurance that 180 million Americans get through their jobs. Incredibly, this proposal offered by Senator BERNIE SANDERS has the backing of many leading Democrats running for President and 109 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

So I want to continue the debate today by focusing on the terrible impact this radical scheme will have on all of the fine men and women who provide healthcare to people across the country. Of course, the impact on them will impact the patients for whom they provide care and services.

I am talking about the Nation's dedicated medical professionals, especially

those who serve in our community hospitals. I actually know many of these healthcare providers because I am one of them. For many years I practiced orthopedic surgery in Casper, WY. I was a medical doctor, a physician, and chief of staff at the Wyoming Medical Center.

When practicing medicine in Casper, WY—or anywhere in the Presiding Officer's home State of Nebraska—you really treat patients from all over the State. That is because many people in Wyoming live in small towns. I am talking about patients in towns like my wife's hometown of Thermopolis, WY. My wife's parents are there. When they need specialty care, they go to Casper. For those who haven't traveled in Wyoming, it is about a 2-hour drive one way when the weather is good.

My point is, when you work in the Casper hospital, you are actually covering a large area in our State, and that is often the case in many States. So when I hear that Washington Democrats want to have a one-size-fits-all healthcare plan, I wonder if they have given any thought to people in the Nation's heartland, to people out west. Are they considering people in rural communities at all?

I will state that I think about the people of Wyoming every day. I am there every week. The staff at small hospitals who serve rural communities like Thermopolis, Rawlins, Lusk, Kemmerer, and at the Lovell hospital, where I attended a health fair this past Saturday, talking to all of the folks there—their needs are things I am not convinced Washington Democrats have any knowledge of or care for at all. The people at these hospitals work hard just to keep the doors open so that they can continue to care for patients right there.

So alarm bells go off when I see headlines like the one from the Washington Post that said:

"Who's going to take care of these people?" As emergencies rise across rural America, a hospital fights for its life.

That is the headline in the Washington Post, referring to a community hospital in Osage County, OK. The hospital has a sign out front that reads: "A small community is only as healthy as its hospital." That is the truth.

Hospitals across rural America are struggling. Many are, in fact, fighting for their lives. Still, Democrats are offering a plan that will destroy private health insurance in America, which is the lifeblood of our Nation's healthcare system; 180 million Americans get their insurance this way.

Democrats want to drastically reduce provider payments which, of course, would drive many doctors from practice and shutter many small hospitals. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Administrator has said a one-size-fits-all system "would decimate physician networks, creating a permanent physician shortage."

So how can rural hospitals survive with no financial cushion if Democrats'

one-size-fits-all healthcare plan passes? Just ask the New York Times, of all people. Last month, the Times ran with this headline: "Hospitals Stand to Lose Billions Under 'Medicare for All.'" Hospitals stand to lose billions.

The Times cites a study from George Mason University that found Medicare provider reimbursement rates are more than 40 percent lower than private insurance rates—40 percent lower. At these payment rates, the Times says, "[s]ome hospitals, especially struggling rural centers," like those in the Presiding Officer's home State and mine "would close virtually overnight."

There would be an overnight closure of hospitals under BERNIE SANDERS' and the Democrats' one-size-fits-all scheme for medicine in America.

I am sure a lot of people listening out there are thinking, maybe it is all a mistake; maybe Democrats don't really mean to threaten hospitals. Well, the fact is, Democrats have long argued that hospitals need to close. That is what they have said.

Look at what Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel, who is an architect of ObamaCare and a professor in Philadelphia, said on the subject. He actually wrote a book outlining all of this. It is titled, "Reinventing American Health Care."

He predicted that 1,000 U.S. hospitals would close by 2020. Well, we are approaching that year. We haven't closed 1,000 in this country, but over 80 have closed, and those are rural hospitals.

Last year he published an op-ed in the New York Times—the same Dr. Emanuel—ominously titled, "Are Hospitals Becoming Obsolete?" He writes:

Hospitals are disappearing. While they will never completely go away, they will continue to shrink in number and importance. This is inevitable and good.

Well, not in rural America—"good," he says, that thousands of hospitals and patients who rely on them are forced to close their doors for good. I disagree fundamentally with this principle and what he is saying.

Of course, all people who practice medicine in small towns want to keep the doors open because they know the impact on the lives of the people who live in those communities. Just last week I had a chance to visit with Dr. Mike Tracy, a family physician in Powell, WY. He is past president of the Wyoming Medical Society. He is passionate about caring for his patients, and guess what. He doesn't participate in Medicare at all. Instead, he provides his services privately by charging his patients a set, transparent monthly fee. He does what he does to keep his practice open. His focus is on his patients, not on Washington paperwork, and his patients are very happy. His practice is successful. The patients are happy with the time he is able to sit and be with them and look at them and focus on them, instead of the mandates of a Washington computer screen.

So you see, there are doctors like Mike all across the country who don't

want a one-size-fits-all healthcare system. Many doctors and many small community hospitals cannot afford it, and they will not survive it. Certainly, many rural communities can't survive it.

As the Presiding Officer knows better than most, as he has traveled his State and as I have traveled mine, if a small community loses a hospital, it is harder to attract doctors, nurses, teachers, businesses—all of the things that are vital for a community to have. So the threat is very real in terms of what the Democrats and what BERNIE SANDERS and the one-size-fits-all healthcare plan would bring to our country.

Let me just tell people who are watching the debate right now: Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare—what this will mean for you is that you will pay more to wait longer for worse care. That is what it means. That is what it means to you. You will pay more to wait longer for worse care. That is what is at stake.

We all need to make our voices heard loud and clear: no to Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme, yes to real reforms that improve healthcare and bring down the costs for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ENERGY INNOVATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it seems a bit surreal but necessary, nonetheless, to come here to the Senate floor to talk about the perils of socialism and its sudden resurgence within the Democratic Party.

We have seen our Democratic friends push for policies like Medicare for All, which would completely wreck the system that provides healthcare for our seniors and force all Americans onto the same plan, regardless of the fact that they never paid anything into it, like our seniors have, and regardless of the fact that they may indeed like their private health insurance that they get from their employers.

Do you remember when the Obama administration promised in 2013, "If you like your plan, you can keep it"? Well, I don't really think they meant it, but that is at least what they said. Democrats have gotten so much more radical today that their motto should be, "If you like your plan, you can't keep it under Medicare for All."

They have also promised things like free college—and, believe me, "free" is popular, especially if you don't think you are ever going to have to end up paying for it—promising anyone and everyone that they can go to college for free.

Now, there are some smart things we can do to help prepare high school students and college students to hold down their debt and to make sure that they get the sort of advice and counseling they need to make sure they are studying something that is going to be able to provide them an income with which they can repay the loans that they take out, and there is some work we need to do in that area.

Across Texas, I have had a chance recently to go to a number of middle schools and high schools, and in Texas—and I am sure we are not alone—there are many high schools where students can get dual credit, college and high school credit, and some of them graduate from high school with essentially 2 years of college behind them, and it costs them nothing. It is free. I guess that is free. Actually, it is not free, either, but they don't have to pay anything more for it, and their parents don't have to pay anything more for their property or sales tax for it.

So that is a smarter way to approach this, rather than this radical idea that things like college can somehow be free, knowing that, actually, there will be somebody that pays for it, whether it is our children, when they grow up and they have to pay back the money that we have recklessly borrowed in our deficits and debt, or by raising taxes, and you can't raise taxes enough on the rich people in order to pay for this. So, inevitably, that burden will fall on the middle class.

To put the icing on the cake on these radical policies, you have to look at this Green New Deal proposal that the Democrats have rolled out and really call this the icing on the cake in their socialist proposals.

They want to take over the entire energy sector of the economy, and they want to regulate it, and they want to tax it in such a way as to promise somehow something that is never going to be realized.

For example, they say they want to achieve net zero emissions in 10 years. Well, Texas, Oklahoma, and other States generate a lot of electricity from renewable sources, particularly wind-generated energy, but there is no way in the world you are going to be able to eliminate things like natural gas and other sources of energy because the wind doesn't always blow and the Sun doesn't always shine. So you are going to need something to provide the baseload when the wind is not blowing and the Sun is not shining. This pie-in-the-sky idea of net zero emissions in 10 years by going entirely to renewables is simply fantasy.

They also want to overhaul our transportation system. They want to rebuild and retrofit every single building in the country, but they offer no real details, and, in fact, I think there is a reason for that, because they don't even talk about the details of what needs to be accomplished or the cost there would be associated with trying to accomplish it.

The only estimate I have seen is a \$93 trillion price tag, but that is an important piece of information that you would think the public would have a right to know, and that is not something the advocates of the Green New Deal have been particularly proud of.

Even if this is something a majority of Americans want, we don't currently have the technology or the resources to make it happen. Our Democratic friends know that. So they are, in essence, making a promise for something that they can't deliver because of the price and because the technology has not yet been invented.

So what was really bizarre here on the Senate floor was that when the majority leader provided our Democratic colleagues a chance to vote on this resolution on the Senate floor, not a single Democratic colleague voted for it. They voted "present."

Well, that is a new one on me. I thought when we came here to the Senate, our job was to represent our constituents and vote yes or no on legislation. To show up and vote "present" seems to me like an abdication of that responsibility, but it also is some evidence of how really cynical and insincere this proposal really is.

That is not to say that it isn't popular when you start offering free things and you start promising things that are unaffordable or unattainable.

Instead of talking about these policies that are unwanted, unachievable, and unaffordable, let's talk about some real solutions. I think that is the responsibility of people like me who say the Green New Deal will not cut it, to which people might ask: Well, what are your suggestions? And I think that is an important and fair question.

No matter what your perspective on energy issues and the environment, I think every single one of us can agree on at least one point: We need smart energy policies that will strengthen our economy without bankrupting American families.

I would just note, parenthetically, that we have actually made some pretty good progress when it comes to emissions control. Between 1970 and 2017, combined U.S. emissions of six criteria air pollutants have gone down 73 percent. During that same period of time, the American economy grew by 262 percent, the number of vehicle miles traveled grew 189 percent, and our population grew 59 percent. We were able to reduce pollutants by 73 percent at a time when the population was growing, people were driving more, and our economy was growing.

More recently, between 1990 and 2017, the United States reduced sulfur dioxide concentrations by 88 percent, lead by 80 percent, nitrogen dioxide by 50 percent, particulate matter by 40 percent, ground-level ozone by 22 percent, and carbon monoxide by 77 percent.

From 2005 to 2017, carbon dioxide emissions declined nearly 15 percent in the United States. During that same period of time—and this is a fair com-

parison—China's annual carbon dioxide emissions have increased roughly by double—twice what they were during the same time period.

So I would say that we can blame America first for all sorts of problems. I don't think that is fair, nor is it accurate, and, particularly, when you start talking about the environment and controlling ozone-depleting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. I think there is a better way to approach it, and we need to start with the facts.

I think the facts are that we need to form partnerships to leverage the capabilities of the private sector and achieve cost-effective solutions. None of the people advocating the Green New Deal can really tell you how much you would be paying for electricity if we were able to implement the Green New Deal, how much you would have to pay for your transportation costs, or how much you would have to pay to heat or cool your house. We need policies that make sense, that are affordable and achievable, and that will actually bring down the cost of each of those items for the American people.

The solution isn't a \$100 trillion Green New Deal; it is good old-fashioned, all-American innovation. By incentivizing research into the development of new technologies, we can keep costs low for taxpayers, while securing our place as a global leader in energy innovation. One great example of the type of solution I am suggesting you could learn about by taking a trip to the NET Power plant in La Porte, TX, right outside of Houston, which I did recently. NET Power has developed a first-of-its-kind power system that generates affordable, zero-emissions electricity using their unique carbon capture technology. They have taken natural gas—one of the most prevalent and affordable energy sources that there is—and they have made it emission-free. This is a shining example of the environmentally and fiscally responsible policies we should be advocating and supporting.

Last year, renewables accounted for only 17 percent of our total energy sources. That includes hydropower, wind, solar, biomass, and various other sources. Seventeen percent. Natural gas already accounts for more than double that. So if we could take this incredibly common and affordable energy source and make it more environmentally friendly, why wouldn't we do that? Why wouldn't that be a more sensible, fiscally responsible way of addressing this?

These policies are important for conservation but also for securing our competitiveness on the world stage. If American companies don't produce these technologies first, well, you bet somebody else will.

The heavyhanded government approaches we are seeing from our Democratic colleagues are not the answer. Instead, we have to harness the power of the private sector and build partnerships to drive real solutions.

Yes, we need to invest in innovative solutions and encourage the private sector to continue prioritizing reliable, affordable, and environmentally sound energy sources.

When you implement government policies that get government out of the way and let the experts do their jobs, you can be pro-energy, pro-innovation, pro-growth, and pro-environment. I will soon be introducing some legislation that I think will help us move down that road. We know the United States leads the world in emissions reduction, and this bill will build on that success without a one-size-fits-all mandate that would bankrupt our country.

DEBBIE SMITH ACT

Mr. President, on another topic, as I highlighted earlier this week, the Senate has unanimously passed the Debbie Smith Act of 2019, which would provide critical resources for law enforcement to test rape kits, prosecute criminals, and deliver justice for victims. This was a major bipartisan achievement, and I look forward to working with our House colleagues to get this legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible.

But there is more we need to do to assist victims of violence and sexual assault. For example, today I am filing the Help End Abusive Living Situations—or HEALS—Act, which will provide domestic violence survivors with expanded access to transitional housing. This will help these victims permanently leave their abusers, rebuild their lives, and begin a long-term healing process.

Even more pressing, folks on both sides of the aisle agree that we need to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act, also known as VAWA. It is something I strongly support and an issue our friend and colleague Senator ERNST continues to champion here in the Senate.

Republicans and Democrats say we must do more to provide services for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, and while we certainly had some disagreements on the way to do that, there is no question that VAWA has traditionally been a bipartisan commitment. That is why I was so shocked earlier this year when House Democrats blocked the Republican effort to reauthorize this critical law before it lapsed last February.

The current violence against women law lapsed in February because House Democrats refused to allow us to extend it. Why would they do that? If they claim to be supportive of efforts to protect women and others from violence and assault, why would they let the very law that authorizes the various programs Congress has paid for in the past—why would they let that lapse? Well, sadly, this is where politics rears its ugly head.

We were seeking a short-term reauthorization of the existing Violence Against Women Act so bipartisan negotiations could continue on a long-term update and extension of the law, but

House Democrats recklessly blocked this reauthorization of VAWA because they were seeking to add controversial provisions that should never be a part of a consensus bill—certainly not one that enjoys broad bipartisan support.

In the face of this political jockeying by House Democrats, I am proud to say that the Appropriations Committee did the right thing: It continued to fully fund all Violence Against Women Act programs through the remainder of this fiscal year. So this means that House Democrats, when they tried to kill VAWA by refusing to reauthorize it, actually failed to accomplish their goal if their goal was to deny women and other victims of violence the critical funding needed for these programs.

Despite the efforts they undertook to let VAWA expire, critical domestic violence and sexual assault prevention programs will continue to receive full Federal funding until we can reach a bipartisan consensus agreement and update the law. So good for the Appropriations Committee for making that happen, but my point is that VAWA should never be used as a political plaything or pawn.

I am somewhat encouraged by ongoing, bipartisan negotiations here in the Senate, and I commend Senator ERNST for her commitment to this effort and look forward to supporting a long-term extension of VAWA that is done in the right way—through negotiation and agreement, not political gamesmanship. That is the wrong way to do things. We know better—if people will simply stop the political posturing and political games and do the work the American people sent us here to do.

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

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

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am here to discuss with my colleagues issues dealing with the work of the Senate Finance Committee and possible legislation that hopefully will come up this summer to keep healthcare costs down, particularly prescription drugs.

In the process of doing that, I want to set the record straight on an issue that affects every American who is eligible for Medicare. More specifically, I am here to talk about efforts to reduce the rising cost of prescription medicine.

Prescription drugs save lives. Millions of Americans like myself wake up every morning and take their daily medication, but there is something that has become a very tough pill to swallow for an increasing number of Americans, and that is paying for the rising cost of prescription drugs.

I applaud President Trump for turning up the volume on this issue last summer. That is when the President announced his administration's blueprint to lower drug costs for all Americans. He found out—and we all found out—that is a goal that has widespread support that includes Republicans and Democrats, as well as urban and rural Americans.

Of course, the President can only do so much—whatever law passed by Congress allows the President to do and that doesn't solve all the issues. So even though I applaud the President, that doesn't mean I exclude in any way the responsibility of Congress to take action.

There are many good ideas to build upon that share broad, bipartisan, bicameral support. There is one policy, however, that some Members are talking about that I don't agree with, and that is repealing what is the noninterference clause in Medicare Part D. I would like to explain why Congress kept the government out of the business of negotiating drug prices in the Medicare program. Some 16 years ago, when I was formerly chairman of the Finance Committee, I was a principal architect of the Medicare Part D program.

For the first time ever, Congress, in 2003, added an outpatient prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program. Maybe I ought to explain for my colleagues why it took between 1965 and 2003 to include drug benefits in the Medicare program. Remember, in 1965, prescription drugs or drugs generally didn't play a very big role in the delivery of medicine like they do today, but over time, they have become more important.

That is why great support at the grassroots, both bipartisan and bicameral, evolved into what we call the Medicare Part D program, adopted in that year, 2003. So we came to the conclusion that adding the prescription drug benefits for seniors was the right thing to do, but it needed to be done in the right way—right for seniors and right for the American taxpayers. By that, I mean allowing the forces of free enterprise and competition to drive costs down and drive value up.

For the first time ever, Medicare recipients in every State had the voluntary decision to choose a prescription drug plan that fit their pocketbooks and their healthcare needs.

The Part D program has worked. Beneficiary enrollment and satisfaction are robust. The Part D marketplace offers consumers better choice, better coverage, and better value; yet here we are again. It has been 13 years since Part D was implemented, and once again, I am hearing the same calls to put the government back into the driver's seat of making decisions on what you can take in the way of pills or what your doctor might be able to prescribe to you based upon what a formulary might be. We want the private sector to decide the formulary, not the



government. So these people happen to be the same backseat drivers who think that centralized government knows everything and knows best.

As the Senator who, once again, chairs the committee with jurisdiction over Medicare policy, I am not going to let Congress unravel what is right about Medicare Part D. Remember, I was a Republican leading the charge to add a new benefit to a government program. A lot of people think that is very uncharacteristic of a Republican, but I told you why I did that: because medicine was becoming an increasing part of the delivery of quality healthcare. So you heard me correctly, I was a Republican chairman working with my Democratic ranking member, Max Baucus, to accomplish Part D. We negotiated an agreement to add prescription drug coverage for seniors.

For me and other Republicans—namely President George W. Bush—there were a few key caveats. First, it must be voluntary. Second, beneficiaries would share the cost with the taxpayer because having skin in the game keeps check on spending and on utilization. Third, we must allow competition—not government mandates—to drive innovation, curb costs, expand coverage, and improve outcomes. It wouldn't work if the Federal Government interfered with delivery of medicine and dictate which drugs would and would not be covered. That is why we wrote a noninterference clause in the law.

My friend, Senator WYDEN, the current Democratic ranking member of the Finance Committee, voted for final passage in 2003. By the way, we are having very good bipartisan cooperation in our Finance Committee on, hopefully, legislation to be debated in our committee in June in regard to lowering drug costs.

The noninterference provision expressly prohibits Medicare from, one, negotiating drug prices; two, setting drug prices; and, three, establishing a one-size-fits-all list of covered drugs. That list is called a formulary. I remember that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle voted for this policy; yet some are now pushing for repeal of that provision.

Here is a list of Democrat leaders who supported and voted to ban Medicare from negotiating drug prices: when he was in the Senate, Senator Biden; Senator Kennedy; Senator Baucus; Senator Reid, the former majority leader; Senator SCHUMER now in the Senate; LEAHY; DURBIN; STABENOW; CANTWELL. On the other side of the Capitol, the list included Speaker PELOSI and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman NEAL.

There is something else that I have learned in all my years talking healthcare policy with Iowans at my annual 99 county meetings where I enjoy a Q and A with whatever agenda my constituents call upon me to discuss with them.

At the end of the day, Iowans don't want the government prescribing life-

saving medications. Iowans want to make those decisions with a physician who is treating them. Last year, 43 million out of 60 million Medicare recipients were enrolled in the Medicare Part D program. That is the vast majority of Medicare beneficiaries nationwide that don't have coverage through a past employer or similar coverage from another source.

Plan sponsors design different plan choices and compete for beneficiaries based on what those plans cover and what they cost. Beneficiaries can pick from many options, with over 3,000 plans offered across 34 geographic areas. In other words, you don't have one plan dictated by the government. Most beneficiaries were covered by a prescription drug plan, and a growing number were covered by a Medicare advantage prescription drug plan.

The Part D base premium amount is low and has remained stable over many years. Looking back to our negotiations in 2003 to get this bill to the President of the United States, we wondered how high these premiums would go, and we were fearful they would just go out of the atmosphere and that they would not be stable like they have been over a long period of time. So the noninterference clause ensures that plan sponsors create plan options that respond to what the beneficiaries—not the government—says it should be.

The nonpartisan congressional scorekeeper, the Congressional Budget Office, has repeatedly stated that repealing this noninterference clause would not save money, unless there was a restricted formulary. As I stated, we wrote this bill in 2003 so the government wouldn't get between you and your doctor on what you ought to have in the way of prescription drugs. So in regard to the cost, I asked CBO to update, and they did. CBO sent me a letter stating the same thing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the May 10, 2019, letter from the CBO.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,  
Washington, DC, May 10, 2019.

KEITH HALL, Ph.D.,  
Director, Congressional Budget Office,  
U.S. Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. HALL: As an author of the Medicare Part D program enacted in the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, I support the statutory provision that prohibits the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) from interfering with negotiations between drug manufacturers, pharmacies, and plan sponsors. The Part D program structure that uses private entities to negotiate and compete to enroll beneficiaries has worked. Program spending has been lower than estimated at the time the program was enacted. Beneficiary enrollment has been robust, and enrollee premiums have remained low and stable. Enrollees are largely satisfied with their plan. The statutory "non-interference" clause is a key reason for the program's success.

While the Part D program has provided beneficiaries with a crucial lifeline through access to prescription medications, improvements are needed to lower high out-of-pocket costs and to realize better value for the taxpayer-supported Medicare program. Some have suggested that allowing the Secretary to negotiate for the price of drugs will achieve those aims. I believe that talk of eliminating the non-interference clause is misguided and counterproductive. I ask that you answer the questions below as to inform the policy debate on this matter.

If the Secretary was given authority to negotiate by Congress and used that authority, would it be possible to obtain savings in Medicare?

Could negotiating by the Secretary over drug prices obtain savings for the Medicare program if those negotiations were limited to selective instances?

Thank you for your attention to the Part D program that has benefited millions of Medicare beneficiaries. Please contact my staff if you have questions.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,  
Chairman.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
U.S. CONGRESS,  
Washington, DC, May 17, 2019.

Re: Negotiation Over Drug Prices in Medicare.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You asked for updated answers to two questions that CBO addressed in a letter to Senator Wyden in 2007. Those questions relate to the Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit and options for allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate over the prices paid for drugs under that benefit. Under current law, the Secretary is prohibited both from interfering in the negotiations between drug manufacturers and the prescription drug plans (PDPs) that deliver the Medicare benefit and from requiring a particular formulary or instituting a price structure for the reimbursement of covered drugs.

The questions and the key conclusions from CBO's response in 2007 are below. CBO continues to stand by those conclusions.

If the Secretary was given authority to negotiate by Congress and used that authority, would it be possible to obtain savings in Medicare?

The key factor in determining whether negotiations would lead to price reductions is the leverage that the Secretary would have to secure larger price concessions from drug manufacturers than competing PDPs currently obtain. Negotiation is likely to be effective only if it is accompanied by some source of pressure on drug manufacturers to secure price concessions. For example, authority to establish a formulary could be a source of pressure. In the absence of such pressure, the Secretary's ability to issue credible threats or take other actions in an effort to obtain significant discounts would be limited. Thus, CBO concluded that providing broad negotiating authority by itself would likely have a negligible effect on federal spending.

Could negotiating by the Secretary over drug prices obtain savings for the Medicare program if those negotiations were limited to selective instances?

The authority to engage in negotiations limited to a few selected drugs or types of drugs under exceptional circumstances could potentially generate cost savings. For example, negotiations could be focused on drugs with no close substitutes or those with relatively high prices under Medicare that are needed to address a public health emergency.

In such cases, CBO expects that the effect of the Secretary's actions—if he or she took advantage of the new authority—would primarily reflect the use of the “bully pulpit” to pressure drug manufacturers into reducing prices. Thus, CBO concluded that the overall impact on federal spending from negotiations targeted at selected drugs would be modest. Beyond that general conclusion, the precise effect of any specific proposal would depend importantly on its details.

If you would like further information on this subject, we would be happy to provide it. The CBO staff contact is Tom Bradley.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,  
*Director.*

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, repealing the noninterference clause means a restricted formulary, which places limits on the drugs that are available to seniors, maybe excluding some drugs that your doctor wants to prescribe for you. I don't believe that Medicare beneficiaries want the government interfering in that process.

Then, as policymakers, we must keep in mind that we are making decisions that affect healthcare choices for the people whom we are elected to represent.

Let's all remember to first do no harm. Repealing the noninterference clause may sound good, but not even a spoonful of sugar will help that bad dose of policy medicine go down.

I come to the floor today to hope that I can put this issue to rest and, as we try to work in a bicameral and bipartisan way to reduce drug costs, that we don't get held up by people who want to do something different by having the government more involved, when it isn't going to save any money and will restrict formularies. It will get the government between you and your doctor.

In other words, I am trying to save Part D. It has been a great success. It is accepted by the people. Let's keep drug costs down without having this issue interfere with our process.

We need to preserve the foundation of private enterprise on which Part D is based—in other words, the marketplace working. We need to get to the real work of reducing prescription drug costs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### FLOODING IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, just to give the Senate body a quick update of what is happening in my State right now, we have had some pretty dramatic flooding and over 15 tornadoes in the last 48 hours across the State. Thankfully, most of those tornadoes hit in open areas. They did not hit structures. There have been some

structures that have been damaged, but the flooding has been far worse than the tornadoes and the high winds.

Just 2 nights ago, in one of our counties, Osage County, we had severe flash flooding, where from 10 p.m. to 2:30 in the morning, over 100 different homes had to be evacuated in the middle of the night. Many of those folks had law enforcement, firefighters, and first responders arriving at their home with a boat or with a truck to get them out, literally, in their pajamas so they could escape. Many of those homes have 4 to 6 feet of water in them now.

It has been intense for those folks who are in the area. In fact, it is interesting. The director of emergency management for that area spent the entire night saving homes and helping people get out. When dawn broke and they knew they had gotten everyone out, he headed back to his own house only to find out he could no longer get to his home anymore because of the floodwaters.

We have had folks all over the State, whether that be in Perry, where we had two homes that were destroyed in a tornado that night that, thankfully, did not hit the center of town. We had other spots, like around Eufaula, where we had some serious flooding; Stillwater, where there has been flooding. In Dale we had a very dangerous overnight tornado that came in, literally, while everyone was sleeping. There are pockets of folks who are there who have been affected by this, literally, all over the State.

For the department of transportation folks, for the folks in our police and fire departments, for the emergency management individuals—both for the State and the counties—for mayors and city managers, for hospitals, for county workers, for city staff, for the Corps of Engineers, and, quite frankly, for just neighbors down the street, it has been a long week. There have been a lot of folks serving each other to take care of those needs, and there will be for a while.

I thought this body would need a quick update because sometimes people feel a long way from the center of the country when you are in Washington, DC, but we need to understand what is happening in the center of the country right now—literally, the center of America. It is affecting all Americans.

#### TULSA RACE RIOT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. President, I did want to tell a story, though. It is a little bit of a different story. It is about 9,000 people in Tulsa who were suddenly left homeless. It wasn't this week, and it wasn't a natural disaster. It was actually on June 1, 1921, when the worst race riot/massacre happened in American history. That story is still one that this body needs to remember.

I brought this up a few years ago, and I thought it may be time to bring it up again. The reason is that we are quickly approaching the 100-year anniversary of a whole series of riots that happened around America in the summer of 1919.

As the soldiers were coming back home from World War I, many of whom were African-American soldiers who had served with great dignity and honor there, they returned back home with skills that they had picked up overseas and with a tenacious patriotism and work ethic. They returned back to America to go back to work, but they were greeted by a lot of White business owners and a lot of White workers in the country who said: You may have served overseas and fought the war, but you are not welcome to work here. And White neighbors started setting homes and cities on fire.

There were riots. There were protests. There was a national pushback that happened in the summer of 1919. Chicago and Washington, DC, were some of the worst. Oklahoma really survived it well.

Interestingly enough, in Oklahoma, we have 30 towns that were considered Black towns, scattered all across the State. The first folks who actually came to Oklahoma who were African American actually came with the five Tribes when they were relocated. They were brought by the five Tribes who had held them as slaves. When they moved from the southeastern part of the country, and they moved to Eastern Oklahoma and were relocated there in that tragic walk, they brought their slaves with them.

In the land rush after 1889 and then years later as we became a State, land started opening up and individuals and families who were African Americans moved from all over the country coming for new hope and opportunity. There were 30 different towns that sprung up all over Oklahoma that were predominantly African-American towns. One of those was Greenwood.

At that time, it was affectionately known as “Black Wall Street.” It was one of the most prosperous African-American communities in the entire country. It was right on the north end of Tulsa.

Although, when they left from Greenwood and came into Tulsa to work, to shop, or whatever it may be, they were limited. In Greenwood, there were shops, stores, movie theaters, lawyers, doctors, and all kinds of activities. Everything was there. But if they walked a few blocks from Greenwood into Tulsa, they found themselves not being welcomed.

In fact, in downtown Tulsa, there was only one place where a Black man could actually go to the bathroom—one. It was in that building that a gentleman named Dick Rowland took the elevator up to go to the bathroom. On the elevator, there was a White girl there named Sarah Page.

We have no idea what happened in that elevator, but when the elevator door opened, she screamed, and a crowd quickly grabbed Dick Rowland and pulled him off, accusing him of all kinds of things, and hauled him off to jail in downtown Tulsa, where, within a few hours, a lynch mob gathered around that jail.

To their credit, law enforcement in Tulsa went out to the streets and said: You all go home. But they did not. The mob stayed there.

Soldiers who had served faithfully in World War I, who were African Americans, who lived in Greenwood, picked up their rifles and gathered together to go in and support law enforcement who was at the jail in downtown Tulsa to protect Dick Rowland.

As they marched down to go help, the law enforcement there apparently said: You all leave as well. We have got this handled.

But as they left, there was a scuffle in the street, and a shot was fired. We have no idea how it happened or which happened first. The news never reported that. But we know that those groups of African-American men left and ran back to Greenwood, and the mob followed them. They marched their way to Greenwood, and they burned it down, destroying Greenwood and wiping out that city.

That night, all night long—May 31 into June 1—America experienced one of its darkest moments. There were 1,200 homes destroyed that night in Greenwood. There were 9,000 people who were left homeless. There were 6,000 African Americans who were rounded up by the police in Tulsa and jailed “for their protection.” They were the ones who were held, not the rioters who actually caused the massacre.

The numbers are all over the place of how many people actually died that night. There are numbers as small as 35 and as large as 300. We will never know. But let’s just say there were many—very likely, hundreds of people—who died that night. One-third of the people were gone, and we have no idea what direction they went. One-third of the people packed up and moved and left, and one-third of the folks stayed. But interestingly enough, that Sunday, after the fire, after the riots, after the destruction and after Greenwood was left leveled, folks from Greenwood gathered that Sunday for worship.

Dr. Olivia Hooker passed away just this last November. She was one of the last survivors of the Tulsa Race Massacre. In an interview shortly before she passed away, she told the story of hearing the men with axes destroy her sister’s piano during the riot. With her three siblings, she hid under a table as her home was literally destroyed around her.

You would think that devastation would be the end of her story. It was not. In World War II, she became the first African American to join the Coast Guard. She earned degrees from two universities and ended up being a professor at Fordham University. That is tenacious resilience.

She reminds me of my modern-day friend Donna Jackson. In 2013, Donna Jackson determined that North Tulsa in Greenwood was known for its entrepreneurship. That is why it got the name “Black Wall Street.” In 2013, she

determined that she was going to challenge 100 new businesses to start in Greenwood, to bring life back to that area again with business and entrepreneurship. For its 100th anniversary, there would be 100 new businesses.

Donna lives and breathes Greenwood. She was born in Morton Memorial. She goes to church in North Tulsa, she works in North Tulsa, and she believes in North Tulsa’s future, as do I. She is going to make her goal of 100 new businesses there. She is doing the work to help introduce people to North Tulsa and to be engaged. There are companies that are from outside the area that are coming in, such as the new QT that just opened there. There are lots of individual businesses that continue to start and thrive again in North Tulsa.

North Tulsa is a place where we should practice basic reconciliation, where America should stop and look again and say “What can be done, and what have we done?” and fix it.

Josh Jacobs was born in North Tulsa in 1998 and graduated from high school in North Tulsa. He ended up making a very bad decision. He left North Tulsa to go play football for the University of Alabama—clearly a terrible decision. Josh ended up being drafted 24th overall by the Oakland Raiders last year. He is a tremendous, shining example of somebody who grew up in North Tulsa and is representing us well.

His dad made an interesting statement. He said that as Josh was growing up, he was a great athlete. He could have traveled anywhere in the area to play football in high school. He chose to stay there on the north side. He said: “This is the north side. Why not build up our side of town? Why take off and leave?”

You would be pleased to know that Josh has on his own Twitter account “2 Peter 3:9.” That is what is pinned at the top.

The Lord is not slow in doing what he promised, the way some people understand slowness. But God is being patient with you. He does not want anyone to be lost, but he wants all people to change their hearts and their lives.

That is a pretty good message, Josh.

I believe we are still a nation of reconciliation. The first step in reconciliation is not forgetting who we were and who we have been as a nation and to make sure we take the steps necessary to resolve broken relationships.

There is not a law we can pass in this body that will solve the race issue. There are ways we can protect and make sure every person has every opportunity, whether it be in housing, employment, or whatever it may be. Race is not a political issue; race is a heart issue. The primary issue with race begins in your own heart and in your own family.

Several years ago, I started asking a very simple question of folks in Oklahoma. I asked that same question of people here. “Has your family ever invited a family of another race to your

home for dinner?” Interestingly enough, the response I get back from most people when I ask that is, they will smile at me and say “I have friends of another race,” to which I will smile at them and say “That is not what I asked. I asked, has your family ever invited a family of another race to your home for dinner?”

Being able to have real dialogue so that your kids can sit with kids of another race and can watch you interact as a parent with people from another race and see that it is normal conversation—our kids believe only what they see, and if they never see someone from another race in our home, they just assume we don’t have friends of another race.

I like to say we will never get all the issues about race on the table until we get our feet under the same table and start talking this out as friends. Reconciliation is not something we can legislate; reconciliation is something we do, it is who we are, and it comes about by action.

Next week, folks will gather in Tulsa, OK, again to recognize that 98 years ago, the city was on fire, and most of the White community looked away while Greenwood burned to the ground. Two years from now, the entire country will probably pause for 24 hours and will look at Tulsa and will ask a simple question: What has changed in 100 years? It is a fair question. I think Tulsa will stand up and say: We will not just show you the structures that it changed, but we will show you the hearts that it changed.

Tulsa is a very different community now. We still have a ways to go, as does the rest of the State, but we are making tremendous progress. While much of the world ignores race and chooses never to deal with race, we as Americans embrace each other and say: What do we have to do to restore what is broken and to make sure we see each other as friends and neighbors again? We are doing it differently, and that is a great benefit to us.

Mount Zion Baptist Church was founded in 1909 by Rev. Sandy Lyons. It was originally just a one-room schoolhouse. In 1916, the church began a \$92,000 endeavor, which I can assure you was a lot of money in 1916. They took out a \$50,000 loan to build a new church. Construction was completed in early 1921. On April 4, 1921, they held their first service, and on June 1 of that same year, a riot burned it to the ground. Worse yet, the White insurance company refused to pay their insurance, saying it was their fault that the riot happened.

That congregation could have been bitter; instead, they stayed put, and they rebuilt that church. They first paid off the mortgage for what had been burned to the ground, and then they rebuilt the church in that same location.

Vernon AME Church still stands in the same spot. The only thing left of that building was the basement, but

they rebuilt, by 1928, right on that same spot.

Dr. Turner there is a friend and is a pastor there. He made this statement:

I'm humbled every day to walk through a place that has seen so much terror but has also been a vessel of hope for so many people. After the massacre, people who lost their homes and their belongings still went to church on Sunday morning.

Believing in a God of reconciliation, whom I still believe in today, let's continue to get better, but let's not forget where we came from so it never ever happens again.

As we think about the summer of 1919, when the Nation was on fire from so many riots around the country, let's continue to finish what has begun in our hearts until that is complete.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

#### ABORTION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep concern over the constant attacks on women's health we are seeing all across America. From this administration's policies, to Donald Trump's judicial nominees, to Governors and legislators in States like Alabama, Georgia, and Missouri under Republican leadership—they are denying women their constitutional right to make their own personal and healthcare decisions.

Women and their healthcare should not be under constant threat. We as a nation have made great efforts to promote equal rights for women and men. In this Congress, we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took a long time for women to get the right to vote, and we continue to make progress on equality. Yet, in the 21st century, the Trump administration continues to push and adopt policies that are setting this country and women in a wrong direction.

The Supreme Court made it clear in *Griswold v. Connecticut* and *Roe v. Wade* that there is a constitutional right to privacy that includes making healthcare decisions such as the use of contraception and the right to access abortion.

Through advancements in women's health and access to contraception and education, the number of unintended pregnancies has significantly been reduced, with a corresponding reduction in abortion. Yet we see Republican leaders trying to reverse the advancements our Nation has made in women's health, access to contraception, and education.

For nearly 50 years, the Supreme Court has upheld the legal precedent of *Roe v. Wade*, including its affirmation in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* in 1992. In that case, the Supreme Court held that "our law affords constitutional protection to personal decisions relating to marriage . . . contraception, family relationships, child rearing, and education. . . . These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a life-

time, choices central to personal dignity and autonomy, are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment."

The Court prohibited States from passing statutes that placed undue burdens on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. Yet Republican leaders continue to introduce and pass laws that interfere with a woman's autonomy over her health and well-being.

Last week, for instance, the Republican Governor of Alabama signed a bill into law banning almost all abortions in that State, with no exceptions for the cases of rape or incest. The law not only prosecutes women, but it also includes unprecedented criminal penalties against doctors, threatening them with life in prison for treating women. The Alabama law exposes doctors to felony charges punishable by up to 99 years in prison for providing or attempting to provide an abortion, making this the most extreme ban of its kind to pass in nearly 30 years.

Since the beginning of 2019, bills attempting to restrict abortion have been filed in 45 States, including Alabama, Missouri, and Georgia.

Earlier this year, Georgia's Republican Governor signed a 6-week ban into law that would make it illegal for women to terminate a pregnancy and a doctor to perform the termination after a fetal heartbeat is detected. I must tell you, many women don't even realize they are pregnant at 6 weeks.

The Alabama and Georgia bills impose burdensome and medically unnecessary limitations on women and their doctors, particularly those in low-income, medically underserved areas. The bills harm women who are victims of sexual assault and minors who are victims of incest. These provisions appear to be designed to perpetrate a culture of not believing women and trying to discredit the victims of assault.

It is hard to understand how many Republicans are talking about getting Big Government out of people's lives but not when it comes to one of the hardest and most intimate decisions a woman can make—a decision that she wishes to make between herself and her doctor. In those circumstances, these same colleagues believe that Big Government, and not the woman herself, knows better. They believe that government, and not the woman, should dictate whether she can or cannot have control of her own body. They believe that government should have the power to force a woman to forgo a medically necessary procedure. They believe that women should be stripped of that power and stripped of the choice to decide what is best for herself. Many believe that even in cases of incest and rape, where the woman is a victim of a crime, that the woman should be compelled to bear the child against her will and bring the pregnancy to term. Talk about being intrusive.

Basically, the rights of women are being trampled to death. I thought we

had gotten beyond that, and now we see that we are moving in the wrong direction.

Empowering women is one of the most important things we can do for the future of our country. Core to women's constitutional liberties is autonomy over their own health and well-being. If we truly want to support women, we need to safeguard and improve, not limit, access to comprehensive healthcare.

I hope we can all agree that on this 100th anniversary of women's suffrage, we should be looking at ways to remove discrimination based upon sex and not moving in the wrong direction by taking away from women their right to make their own healthcare decisions.

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

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

#### SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, we are now 5 months into the new 116th Congress. During that 5-month period, the new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has passed a series of bills on issues important to the overwhelming majority of the American public. They include legislation to reduce the death toll from gun violence by requiring universal criminal background checks and legislation to end the millions and millions of dollars of secret money flowing into elections and polluting our politics. The House legislation includes a bill to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work, and the House has also passed legislation to strengthen the protections under the Violence Against Women Act. Those are just some of the initiatives the House has passed in the last 5 months.

Here in the Senate, what has the Senate done on those important issues? What has the Senate done with the legislation that the House has passed and is now sitting in this body? We have done nothing—zip. We haven't taken up any of those bills. In fact, the Senate Republican leader has refused to allow this body to consider those important measures.

What are we doing instead? Instead, the Senate is consuming all of its time not on the matters most important to the public but on debating and confirming judicial and executive branch nominees. Here is the thing: If you look at these judicial nominees—let's just take the ones we are looking at this week—you will find a very dangerous pattern.

This week, in looking at the five nominees, the pattern is selecting judges who will strip away women's reproductive choices and who will strip

away and potentially eliminate the rights under *Roe v. Wade*. That is the clear pattern.

If you look at the records of these nominees, they indicate hostility toward a woman's right to choose and hostility to *Roe v. Wade*. Take, for example, Stephen Clark. He is the nominee for the Eastern District of Missouri. He drew the outrageous comparison between Dred Scott and *Roe v. Wade*, including *Roe* as bad law. He also opposed provisions in the Affordable Care Act that would expand access to contraception to help people avoid unintended pregnancies.

Then there is the nomination of Kenneth Bell to be a judge in the Western District of North Carolina. He has argued that abortion rights, the pro-choice position, is "indefensible" and went on to say that "there is no middle ground" on this issue. In other words, he is another judge who would deny women the right of reproductive choice, and the list goes on if you look at the list of judges who are before the Senate this week.

This would be alarming at any point in time, but the timing of these nominations is no coincidence. Just in the last couple of months, we have seen States around the country passing laws to take away a woman's right to choose.

Let's take a look at Alabama. In the case of Alabama, they passed a law that denies a woman's right to choose to have an abortion even in the case of rape or incest. Under the Alabama law, doctors who perform abortions could be locked up in prison for up to 99 years—a prison term longer than that of a rapist.

We also have Candidate Trump arguing that not only should doctors be punished but women who exercise their rights to reproductive choice should be punished too.

Meanwhile, in addition to Alabama, five other States have passed laws that would outlaw abortion at a very early stage—in fact, at a stage of pregnancy when many women do not realize they are yet pregnant, especially if the pregnancy is unplanned and unexpected.

I think people recognize how outrageous it is to see State legislators and other elected officials who normally take the position that the government has no place in regulating or being involved in any aspect of our lives, who then take the position that they want the government right between a woman and her most sensitive decisions with respect to reproductive choice.

We have legislators who say they don't want the government protecting people from air pollution. They don't want to pass any regulations to protect people from air pollution or water pollution. We have some legislators who say they don't want any legislation to protect consumers from predatory lending or other scams in the economy. They don't think the government has a role there, but, by God, when it comes

to interfering with a woman's right to choose, they want the government smack in the middle of that decision. That is what Alabama has done. That is what the other five States have done.

Now we have judicial nominees coming before the Senate who are going to sign off potentially on those State laws.

It gets even more alarming because we also see a pattern from the judicial decisions that have been made and from the records of a lot of the nominees who are before us now of judges or people being appointed, who not only want to strip away a woman's right to reproductive choice but who actually want to go after programs that help provide family planning, programs that help prevent unwanted and unplanned pregnancies. So, on the one hand, States are passing these laws restricting a woman's right to choose, but at the same time they are saying that they want to get rid of or severely limit programs that prevent unintended pregnancies.

Looking at the figures from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—and they keep statistics on all sorts of health indicators—you will find that from 2006 to the year 2015, there was a 24-percent drop in the number of abortions in the United States. There was a 24-percent drop in the years between 2006 and 2015. Researchers who have looked into this have determined that the biggest driver behind this decline in abortion has been increased access to contraception and family planning. Yet the Trump administration is going after and targeting for elimination the very programs that help reduce unintended pregnancy and, therefore, also help reduce abortions. So this administration is trying to take a hatchet to title X. They want to essentially take Planned Parenthood out of the equation, even though Planned Parenthood provides family planning services to 4 in 10 women.

As we all know, Planned Parenthood is barred by law from spending any Federal dollars on abortion. They spend most of their time counseling their patients on family planning and helping people make decisions about contraception to avoid unplanned pregnancies.

This administration tried to target the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program. I know that because it went after a program in Baltimore City that has been very successful in reducing teenage pregnancy.

In fact, if you look at Baltimore from a period during the year of 2000 to 2016, we saw a 61-percent decline in teen pregnancy. That was as a result of a number of programs, easier access to contraception, the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program that was targeted for elimination by the Trump administration, and, after the Affordable Care Act went into effect, the ability to access contraception as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

All of these measures to help prevent unplanned pregnancies have also helped to significantly reduce the number of abortions. Yet we have an administration that wants to go after those family planning programs, and we have a number of judges who would side with the administration. I will mention a couple of important family planning programs.

One is title X. This administration wanted to severely undermine title X. It has not been successful. Why not? Because it was taken to court. So far, the courts have stayed the administration's decision.

Let's look at the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which I mentioned, that is so important in Baltimore. The administration wanted to eliminate it, and so we had to go to court. The judge said that it was an illegal action—an unauthorized action—by the Trump administration.

Let's look at the contraception provisions—the provisions on access to contraception—in the Affordable Care Act. This administration wants to wipe them out. The only reason they are still there is due to the courts. The courts have been very important not only in protecting a woman's right to choose but in protecting these important family planning programs that have prevented unintended pregnancies and, therefore, have also reduced the number of abortions.

Now we have a whole bunch of judges who are coming before the Senate who would rule differently in all of these cases. That is why I believe the American people need to really be alarmed about what is happening here. We are not acting on important measures that are coming out of the House that I mentioned earlier. What we are doing is spending the full time passing through judges—in a factory-like procedure here—who will undermine a woman's right to choose and go after important family planning programs. We have a lot to think about, and I hope all of our colleagues will recognize what is happening here.

I will go back to where I started.

Instead of churning out judges who are going to strip away the rights of women—and other nominees who side with big corporations against consumers—let's take up the legislation that is in front of us right now that has come over from the House.

We have before us H.R. 8. It is the Bipartisan Background Checks legislation. It was bipartisan because it came out of the House on a bipartisan vote.

It was bipartisan because, if you ask the public, 85 percent of the public is in favor of the simple idea that we should have criminal background checks and that the people who have committed crimes shouldn't be able to go to gun shows and purchase guns. If you have a record of posing a danger to the community, my goodness, why would we want to put a gun in your hand and endanger the community?

It is a pretty straightforward piece of legislation, and it has been in this Senate for 83 days now. For 83 days, it has been sitting right here in the Senate, but the Republican leader will not let us take it up to debate it or to vote on it.

I mentioned another bill that came over from the House that would get rid of secret money in politics. What do I mean by that?

After the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United*, we had two things happen. One was that just a flood of corporate money flew into elections because, before that decision, corporations could not spend money directly to try to elect public officials. The Congress had previously passed a law to prevent that, and previous Supreme Courts had upheld that ban on corporate spending to try to elect public officials. In *Citizens United*, they decided, well, corporations are people, too, for the purpose of spending money in elections. So they got rid of that law.

If you read that opinion, even those who voted to overturn those laws said that what is going to protect the system will be the public's knowing who will be spending all of that money. They said: All right, we are going to let corporations spend all of that money. We are going to let 501(c)(4)s spend all of that money. Do you know what? The public will know, and that will serve as a check on the system. That will provide transparency, and the transparency will provide accountability.

Guess what. It didn't happen. In fact, the Senate's Republican leader has been one of the arch opponents of any kind of transparency and disclosure. I have had a long-running back-and-forth with him on this issue because, even if you look at the proponents of the terrible *Citizens United* decision, as I said, those Justices said: Well, transparency will take care of it. The reality is that people spend millions and millions of dollars in secret money in elections.

Let me just tell people that it may be secret to the public, but it is not a big secret to the candidates who are running. It is not a big secret to them who is spending millions of dollars to try to get them elected or to defeat them. That is a farce. Years ago, when I was in the House, I authored something called the DISCLOSE Act. It passed the House. It died here by one vote. We got 59 votes on an almost identical bill. It didn't get 60. So we still have secret money in politics today.

My view is that voters have a right to know who is spending millions of dollars to try to influence their decisions, and that is a big part of the bill that came over from the House 74 days ago. It is called the For the People Act. It has a lot of other important provisions in it to protect our elections and important provisions to make sure that we uphold the right to vote.

Among the important provisions is the DISCLOSE Act—to get rid of secret

money in politics. That is sitting over here and has been for 74 days.

What else has the House sent over? It sent over the Equal Pay Act, which has a pretty straightforward idea, and I think most Americans agree with it. In fact, public surveys show that people agree that if you put in an equal day's work—if you put in the sweat equity, if you do the job—and if a woman does the job just like the man does the job, by God, obviously, she should get paid the same amount. It is a pretty simple concept. That came over from the House. In fact, it came over from the House just 55 days ago. For 55 days, it has been sitting here.

Another bill that has come over from the House also relates to making sure that we address issues that are important to all of us, but it has specifically dealt with the Violence Against Women Act. What we say within the Violence Against Women Act, in the House bill, is that if you have someone who is abusing you in a relationship—it doesn't have to be your spouse; it could be someone else who is abusing you in a relationship—they shouldn't be able to go out and buy a gun. What we have seen from the sad statistics is that those kinds of situations often escalate into somebody's getting killed when someone is in a relationship in which one of the people in that relationship is abusing the other.

Just as we prevent the sale of guns to spouses who have records of domestic violence and domestic abuse, we should extend that prohibition on running out and getting guns to other abusive relationships. That was the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, and it passed out of the House 47 days ago. So, 47 days ago, the House passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

It passed the Paycheck Fairness Act—equal pay for equal work—55 days ago.

It passed the For the People Act 74 days ago, which includes the provision to get rid of secret money in politics.

It also passed the Bipartisan Background Checks Act—to reduce the death toll from gun violence in our country—83 days ago.

All of those bills are sitting right here in the Senate. We could be debating them today if the Republican leader would allow them to come up. Instead of taking up that important work, we are here, acting like those in a factory who churn out more judges who have records of stripping women of their right to reproductive choice. It is a very, very dark time in the Senate, and I hope that we will get about the business of the American people and stop stripping women of their constitutional rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Missouri.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN R. CLARK

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I think, by any standard, it is a stretch to suggest that we are churning out judges.

We are doing our constitutional job of confirming judges that the President is constitutionally required to nominate. We are going to vote on a Missouri judge today, Judge Stephen Clark, to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

In the process of churning out judges, Judge Clark—or soon-to-be Judge Clark, I hope—was told by the White House in July of 2017 that he was going to be its nominee for this place on the court. If it were July of 2017 and it is now May of 2019, the churning is, obviously, not going very well. In fact, to get people to even serve in these jobs is going to get increasingly difficult.

In the case of Steve Clark and his family, he had a pretty unique practice that was focused on him and a couple of associates. I am not even sure of the kind of law they practiced, but I am sure it was not the kind of law that was referred to a minute ago. His wife was the assistant in the office, and I think they had an associate or two.

Yet, if all of your clients have been told for 20 months or so that you are going to be a district judge, the first question they ask is, Can you handle this case?

The answer you give is, Well, I don't know, but probably not. Eventually, Congress will get to this, and, eventually, I will be confirmed.

From the time of July 2017 to November 2018, there was nobody coming in the door anymore, and the law practice closed, as it should. It was not forced to close. Clearly, the best thing to do was to go ahead and admit that the supporting effort of that practice had gone away but that the overhead was still there. Since November, Stephen Clark has been waiting for this day to happen. This is not churning out judges, and I may get back to this topic in just a minute.

Certainly, for nominees like him who are willing to have their names submitted—who are willing to say yes when asked if they would be willing to be nominees—we have to do a better job, not the job of suggesting that somehow this happens easily to people who aren't qualified.

Steve Clark has been a respected, practicing attorney in the Eastern District of Missouri for 28 years. He knows the law; he knows the community. The American Bar Association rated him “well qualified” to hold this job.

He has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee twice now, once in 2016—see if I have that right; there is so much history here, it is hard to even know what the book would look like—and once before the 2018 election. Then all of these nominees had to be sent back to the White House, so after the 2018 election, after the Congress started work again in January of 2019, his name had to be resubmitted. The committee had to vote on him again. They had to look once again to see that he was “well qualified” to hold this job. They had to once again verify that he had 28 years in private practice.



We even had a past president of the Missouri Bar Association, who is a Democrat, say: "Steve Clark will make an excellent addition to the federal court bench."

The very idea that we characterize judges we are putting on the courts as enemies of any group of people is pretty offensive when you think about it. The law of the land is the law of the land. Judges are bound by precedent. Certainly, lawyers are bound by precedent. There is nothing to suggest anything other than the "well qualified" status of the bar association.

We need to fill this vacancy. We even have a temporary judgeship in the Eastern District. The workload is so great that the temporary judgeship should become permanent, but that is not the judgeship we are talking about here.

We are talking about somebody who is ready for this job, willing to give up his law practice with what should have been an absolute certainty he would be confirmed, but no absolute certainty he would be confirmed. I certainly wish the process hadn't taken so long, but I am glad we were able to adjust the rules of the Senate last month to start getting more people through that process. Without that, people in this case in my State—the people in the Eastern District of Missouri—would have to wait even longer. We may have never gotten this judgeship filled if we hadn't changed the rules.

Unfortunately, there are still a whole lot of people waiting to be confirmed to important jobs in the government. There is still too much obstruction for no real reason.

In fact, in past Congresses, judgeships like this would have been filled by unanimous consent. We would have filled five or six a day if we had vacancies of well-qualified candidates at the end of the day with no debate, but our friends on the other side have decided: No, we are going to take the maximum amount of debatable time available for, say, a Supreme Court Justice or the Attorney General of the United States, and we are going to apply that to every job—district judges, the assistant secretary of whatever, who is the lowest person appointed in whatever Cabinet office there is. We are going to apply the 30 hours to them. Of course, what you did to do that is use up all of this time because nothing else can happen on the floor during that 30 hours.

Was debate happening on the floor during that 30 hours? Of course not. The average debate time used during that 30 hours was 24 minutes. So for the other 29 hours and 36 minutes, nothing happened that related to that judgeship.

This morning, when I was driving to the Capitol, I actually heard somebody on one of the news programs say: Now they are forcing judges to be confirmed with only 2 hours of debate instead of the 30 hours that should have been used.

That would have been a valid criticism if the 30 hours were ever used, but

when the 30 hours is only 24 minutes, it is no criticism at all. It is a ridiculous position to take. You don't have to be a genius to see that it is designed to not allow the President to have the jobs confirmed in the government that the Congress has determined that the Senate would have to confirm. There are, I think, about 970 of them. By the way, if you took 30 hours for each of the 970, I think it would have been impossible—and we were proving it was impossible—for the President to ever get a government in place.

Then the judicial vacancies that occur—this is a vacancy we are filling today that was vacant months before President Trump was elected, maybe 3 months, maybe 4 months, but we haven't had anybody in this judgeship now for well over 2 years. In fact, as I said earlier, we have had, for 22 months, somebody who was told they were going to be the nominee and to prepare to serve.

In the 3 weeks we were in session before the rule change, we were able to confirm seven nominees in 3 weeks, and that was the principal work we were doing in that 3 weeks. These nominees fill jobs that are running the government or court positions that they are appointed to serve in for a long time. We filled seven of them in 3 weeks.

In the 3 weeks after we had the rule change, we cleared 24 nominees in that period of time.

By the way, the debate spent an average of 3 minutes—of the 2 hours that were available to those 24 nominees, the average time spent debating was 3 minutes. The minority is still suggesting that we are going to use the maximum time no matter how little time is used, no matter how little time is called for, because even if it is not 30 hours—it is now 2 hours—we can force 2 hours of no legislative opportunity and no legislative planning as the Senate tries to do part of the job that only the Senate can do. The House doesn't do this; only the Senate can do this. This is a job that is done by the President, who nominates, and the Senate, which confirms.

If you can keep the Senate confirming part to a maximum use of time, if you are in the minority, you can keep the legislating opportunities to a minimum.

Now, somebody might say: Well, gee, what would they bring to the floor? There are a lot of things we would bring to the floor if we had the time to get on them and stay on them.

Of course, we would really like to bring the appropriating bills to the floor soon and do those.

We cleared 24 nominees with an average of 3 minutes of talking about each one—maybe a few minutes. I think that even includes the time just making aspersions about these nominees in general, which don't relate to anybody. That would be included in that 3 minutes as well.

We continue to have a lack of cooperation to do the job of the Senate in the way that for 200 years it was done.

I hope my friends on the other side will begin to work with us and begin to understand that everybody has caught on. The people in this building and outside this building know what has been happening for almost 2.5 years now, and more responsibility is going to have to be taken than has been taken up until now.

I will say, again—almost 2 years after Steve Clark was nominated—I believe we will finish that job today, and if we do, it will be a good day for him, a good day for his family, and a good day for people waiting to get an opportunity on the Federal court docket in the Eastern District of Missouri to have a person not decided by me to be well qualified for the job but decided by the American Bar Association and twice approved by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate. While this work has taken a long time to get done, it will be good to see it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning we had a meeting in Speaker PELOSI's office of the Democratic congressional leaders. It was in preparation for a meeting with President Trump.

Three weeks ago, NANCY PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER, the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, asked for a sit-down with the President in the Cabinet Room to discuss the infrastructure of the United States of America—the backbone of our economy, a part of America that, sadly, has been neglected for too many years.

President Trump promised in his campaign there would be an infrastructure program—put America to work to build the roads, the bridges, and the airports, and I might say broadband and so many other things that need to be done—so that the strength of this economy would be there to entertain new business opportunities, to attract new jobs.

We had this meeting 3 weeks ago, and it was amazing how well it went. I was sitting just a couple of seats removed from the President and heard an agreement in the room from the Democratic leaders and the President—\$2 trillion, the President said. He rejected our offer of \$1.5 trillion and said: No, make it \$2 trillion that we will spend on our infrastructure.

Everybody sat up straight in their chairs and said: Well, this President is serious.

We said: Mr. President, will it be 80 percent Federal spending and 20 percent local, the way it has always been?

Yes.

Can we include rural broadband in here so those of us who represent small towns—rural areas that don't have the benefit of broadband services—can get into the 21st century in terms of education and telemedicine and all of the things that brings?

Yes.

He signed up for all these things—\$2 trillion, 80 percent Federal—and the list was long of things that we were going to do together.

We went into detail in that meeting 3 weeks ago with the President about some of the aspects of it. For example, the President said—and I think he has been quoted before—that he does not approve of public-private partnership programs. He argues there is too much litigation. That is all right with me and for most of the people in the room. We didn't have to have that if the President didn't want to include it. So there was back and forth in this conversation.

There was one element missing, and I remember RICHARD NEAL—who is the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the critically important committee, the counterpart of Senate Finance—said to the President: Now, Mr. President, we have to pay for it. Two trillion dollars—how are we going to do that?

And the President said: Wait. I am not going to say that at this meeting. I know you want me to blink first as to how we are going to pay for it. I am not going to get into that.

There had been some proposals from Democrats of tax increases for wealthy people and corporations and such, but the President said: I won't get into that today. Let's meet 3 weeks from now and talk about how we are going to do this, how we are going to pay for the \$2 trillion.

So many of us sat down, Democrats—I hope Republicans, as well—and started thinking in positive terms about what this would mean for the economy. We can create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs across the United States, rebuild our infrastructure, and be ready to compete with countries like China and others that believe they are building faster and better than we are.

The meeting was scheduled for today. We started this morning with a briefing. The Democrats sat together in Speaker PELOSI's office, about 20 of us, and went through it and talked about what our presentation would be to the President and some ideas that we had to move forward.

We accepted the President's invitation. We went to the White House, gathered in the waiting room there, and then we were invited into the Cabinet Room. We walked into the Cabinet Room, took our assigned seats, looked across the table, and there was the Secretary of the Treasury, people from the Office of Management and Budget. The President's daughter was there. There was quite a gathering of people getting ready for this high-powered meeting.

We waited, and we waited, and then the door opened, and the President walked in. Without greeting anyone or sitting down he said: We are not going to have this meeting. We are not going to have this meeting because Congress continues to investigate me. I think we have had enough investigations, and

until the investigations end, there will be no infrastructure bill.

His statement went quite a bit beyond that, but I think that was a fair summary of his conclusion. He turned around and walked out.

So the meeting that he had called, the meeting we responded to so that we could come up with an infrastructure program, ended right on the spot.

The President then went out into what is known as the Rose Garden next to the White House and held a press conference with posters and signs saying: As long as Congress is investigating me, we won't be discussing issues like infrastructure.

That is an unfortunate development—unfortunate for America, first, because this President and this Congress, regardless of party, have a responsibility to the American people to do the basics to make sure that we provide what Americans need, what cities need, what businesses need, what families need to grow the economy and create good-paying jobs.

The President walked away from that this morning. So here we are at a point in history. I am not sure which way to turn. You see, every President would like to make this claim: I am not going to do business with Congress if you investigate me. But the bottom line is, every President is investigated. Their administration is investigated. That is what we do. That is what the U.S. Congress does. That is what happens in a democracy. No President can say: I am pulling down the shades, and I am closing the doors. You can't look at me, and you can't look at what we are doing, either in activities as individuals or as agencies.

No. There is accountability in our government. This Congress, the Senate, the House—we appropriate the funds for the executive branch, and we investigate them as we appropriate the money. How are you spending the taxpayers' dollars? Are you wasting them? Is there corruption involved in it? We ask those questions not just of this President but of every President. That is the nature of democracy, of accountability, and this President can't get off the hook. He may be weary of investigations—and I can tell you that President Obama was weary of investigations, too, and President Bush before him—but that is the nature of accountability in a democracy. For this President to say: No more. It is out of bounds for us to be investigated, and I won't do anything necessary for the economy and future of this country as long as the investigation continues—that is a sad day in the history of this country. I hope cooler heads will prevail, but I am not sure they will.

We have so much we need to do. Look at this empty Chamber here. My speech in this Chamber each day is basically what you are going to hear if you are a visitor to Washington, DC. You are not going to hear a debate on legislation. Wouldn't you like for this Chamber to be filled with Republicans and Demo-

crats who are debating a bill right now on the high cost of prescription drugs? I would. And we certainly have the power and responsibility to manage that issue, but we don't do it. We have done virtually nothing in this Chamber for this entire year.

Senator MCCONNELL has one goal: fill up Federal judicial vacancies with lifetime appointees as fast and as often as possible. We have seen men and women come before us, clearly unqualified to be judges, who are being given lifetime appointments. Why? It is part of a plan—a political plan to fill the courts with judges friendly to the Republican point of view. And so we do nothing else. Nothing else.

I have been here a few years, in the Senate and the House. There is an issue called disaster aid. I have seen 100 different variations. There will be some horrendous weather event—a fire, a drought, a flood—and we have responded time and again wherever it occurred. Without concern as to whether it was a red State or a blue State, we have come together as an American family and said: We will give you a helping hand.

We have a disaster bill that has been pending here for weeks, if not months. We can't even reach an agreement on how to send disaster aid to areas that have been hit by flooding and tornados, and it is an indication of what the problem is right here. The Senate is not being the Senate. It is not legislating. And now the President announced this morning that he has gone fishing. He is not going to be around to discuss issues like the infrastructure of this country.

What can we do about it? Well, you can appeal to your Members of Congress and tell them you are fed up with it, and I hope you do. That is what a democracy is about. But you can also make sure that you participate and vote in the next election. Ultimately, in a democracy, the American people have the last word at the polling place on election day. If you are satisfied with an empty Chamber doing nothing, ignoring infrastructure, delaying disaster aid, if you think that is a good thing for this country, I suppose you know how you should vote. But if you are fed up with it and looking for change, I hope people across this country will see what happened today as a call to arms—maybe, importantly, a call to the polls.

IRAN

Mr. President, yesterday there was a briefing for Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans. It was a closed-door briefing in an area of the Capitol the public has no access to. In that briefing room, they close the doors; they take away your telephone; and they ask if you have any other electronic devices to make sure that when you walk in that room, you can hear things, classified information, sometimes top-secret information, which is not available to most Americans and should not be. It is sensitive.

It is important. It relates to our national security. We don't meet there a lot—maybe once a month at most—and when we meet, we are together as Democrats and Republicans for a briefing.

The briefing yesterday was from the Secretary of State, Mr. Pompeo, and the Acting Secretary of Defense. They came in and talked to us about the situation in Iran. I can't disclose the specifics—I am duty bound not to—but I can speak in general terms about what was said and what I think it means to the rest of America.

I listened in disbelief yesterday to the administration's briefing justifying a confrontation with Iran. While I was listening, I thought to myself, before America plunges into another Middle Eastern war, we ought to take stock and remember how we got into the two wars in that part of the world—two wars, one of which is still raging, that left American soldiers subject to injury and death every day and cost American taxpayers billions of dollars.

When we got into wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, we were led to believe that suddenly there were urgent events spiraling out of control in the Middle East that could only be stopped by U.S. military intervention. Some of my colleagues still in Congress today were here during that debate. On the floor of the Senate, we voted on the question of the invasion of Iraq. I remember it because it was about 4 weeks before the election. The vote was taken around midnight, and most Members, as they voted, left. I stayed because I wanted to hear the final vote.

There were 23 of us who voted against the invasion of Iraq: 1 Republican—Senator Chafee—and 22 Democrats. I can recall that some of my colleagues who voted against that invasion of Iraq lingered in the well. One of them was Paul Wellstone of Minnesota. Wellstone was up for reelection—a tough reelection in his home State. The popular sentiment was on the side of the invasion of Iraq. Wellstone voted against it.

I went up to him, and I said: "Paul, I hope this doesn't cost you the election."

He said to me: "It is all right if it does. This is who I am. This is what I believe, and the people who elected me expect nothing less."

Sadly, Paul Wellstone died in a plane crash before that election a few weeks later. I still remember him right there in the well, talking to him about that vote.

At the time, we had been told by Vice President Cheney and others that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, which threatened not only friends and allies, like Israel, but could threaten the United States of America.

Former Pentagon adviser Richard Perle argued before the invasion of Iraq that the Iraqis were going to pay for the war from their oil wealth. They would pay for this—whatever it would cost the American taxpayers—and he

said there was no doubt that they would.

President George W. Bush claimed the war was his last choice, and then he provocatively tried to link al-Qaida—the terrorists responsible for 9/11—with Saddam Hussein, the leader of Iraq—a specious claim that has never been proven and was restated by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. Rumsfeld even tried to claim that a war in Iraq would last—listen to this—"five days or [maybe] maybe five weeks or five months, but it certainly isn't going to last any longer than that," said our Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. We are now in the 18th year of that war.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Vice President Cheney said that when the Americans arrive in Iraq, we would be welcomed as liberators. Wolfowitz went on to say—he estimated that this call for hundreds of thousands of American troops to fight there was way off the mark.

Five days or 5 weeks or 5 months?

Well, the war started not long after these claims. It included deploying more than 150,000 American troops over and over and over again, and it has lasted for 18 years. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. We were not greeted as liberators. The Iraqi oil interest did not pay for the cost of the war; the American taxpayers and families did. Sadly, more than 4,500 Americans gave their lives in that war, and 32,000 were wounded, some gravely wounded.

One of those wounded veterans is my colleague in the Senate, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH. She was in the National Guard as a helicopter pilot. Twelve years ago, when she was flying over Iraq, a rocket-propelled grenade came into the cockpit and exploded. As the helicopter came to a crash on the ground, Tammy lost both of her legs and was at that point in danger of losing her arm, which she didn't, thank goodness. Today, she serves as my colleague in the Senate.

In one of the many cruel ironies in what I believe to be one of the worst foreign policy disasters in American history, the unintended consequence of our invasion of Iraq was to give the nation of Iran a strategic victory by virtually turning Iraq into a client state.

Make no mistake—our war and invasion of Iraq emboldened and empowered Iran. How do some of the current occupants of the White House driving policy against Iran feel about the Iraq war disaster? Well, in 2015, National Security Advisor John Bolton said: "I still think the decision to overthrow Saddam was correct." He made that statement 1 month after writing a New York Times op-ed—this is John Bolton, the President's National Security Advisor—an op-ed entitled: "To Stop Iran's Bomb, Bomb Iran."

Now match this painful lesson in history with the current President having surpassed 10,000 false or misleading claims so far in a little over 2 years in

office—more than 10,000 false claims in less than 3 years. So you will understand my skepticism in trusting this administration of the President's to tell us the truth about the next war they are planning in the Middle East. In fact, within a single week, President Trump tweeted that he had hoped not to go to war with Iran and then went on to tweet that he would lead the fight "that will be the official end of Iran." You can't keep up with this President and his tweets.

Does this not trouble or give pause to any Republican colleague whose constituents might be called to serve in the third Middle Eastern war that the United States is participating in?

Let me also remind my colleagues that before any one of us can vote on the Senate floor, we walk down this aisle, over to this corner, and wait for the Vice President of the United States to ask us to take the oath of office, to swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution of this country makes it expressly clear that the decision to go to war cannot be made solely by a President; it is to be made by the American people through their elected representatives in Congress, in the House and in the Senate. Before there is any war, the American people should have the last word, according to our Constitution.

What I find most stunning about the administration's march to war in Iran is that its actions have really contributed to the current tension and confrontation we have in Iran. President Obama worked for years to come up with an agreement and to bring together an alliance to make certain that Iran could never develop a nuclear weapon.

Listen to the participants in this alliance: of course, the United Kingdom, our longtime ally; France; the European Union; the United States; Germany; Russia and China. They are all part of this agreement to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. The Republicans opposed it to a person, but the President was able to implement it.

That agreement called for constant inspection by United Nation's agencies—nuclear agencies—to make certain that Iran lived up to the terms of the treaty and did not develop nuclear weapons. It worked. The inspectors came and told us, time and again, there were no locked doors, there was no denial of entry, no denial of access. They were able to look behind closed doors and came to the conclusion that Iran was complying with the treaty and not developing nuclear weapons.

Then President Trump announced he was walking away from this agreement, walking away from this requirement under the treaty for neutral inspectors to crawl all over Iran and make sure they were living up to the terms of the agreement. That was the beginning of the Trump policy on Iran that leads us to where we are today.

President Trump has been pursuing a provocative and incomprehensible policy of regime change in Iran, trying at one moment to flatter and meet with President Rouhani to negotiate and then the next moment threatening to obliterate Iran from the planet. President Trump withdrew from that nuclear agreement and tried to starve Iran of the agreed benefits it was to receive from that deal.

Let me be clear, there is no doubt that Iran is responsible for dangerous conduct around the world, which I will never approve of, but an Iran with nuclear weapons is dramatically more dangerous than one without. The President doesn't understand that basic fact. Why not push back against Iran without withdrawing from the nuclear agreement? Why give them the pretext for belligerence and undermine our credibility with the global powers that joined us in that nuclear agreement?

The tragic end result of this President's incoherent policy in Iran is that our allies are united against us, and Iran may restart nuclear activities within the next few weeks. President Trump's policy at the direction of Mr. Bolton seems to have only increased regional tensions, incentivized Iran to restart its nuclear weapons program, and fomented a pretext for another Middle Eastern war.

This Congress, too often a rubberstamp for this President's worst behavior, must do more in the next few weeks and months to stop this effort based on the briefing we received yesterday. Wars are so easy to get into and so difficult to get out of. When I hear our advisers, in general terms, talking about short wars, I think about Iraq, and I think about Afghanistan and the fact that, 18 years later, with gravestones all across the United States, we are still paying the price for decisions that were made so long ago. Let us think twice before we engage in direct military confrontation with any country and, certainly, with Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1602 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I don't have a speech prepared. I just want to share a few thoughts with my colleagues. What I am about to say I intend to say gently and constructively, and that is this: We need to do more. We need to do more. By "we," I mean the U.S. Congress.

We have completed almost 25 percent of the time allotted to this current Congress. And what have we done? Other than nominations, which are important—and I will come back to that—we have done nothing—zero, zilch, nada.

Let me talk about my friends in the House of Representatives first. I have great respect for them. I wish I had served in the House. I would have loved to have had that experience. So far, our friends in the House—at least the leadership—have done two things. No. 1, they have passed bills they know have not a hope in Hades of passing the U.S. Senate. We call those bills messaging bills, as you know. They are not designed for the next generation. They are designed for the next election. They don't do anything to make the American people any more secure or improve the quality of their lives, and we all know that.

The second thing that my friends in the House leadership have done—and I say this with all the respect I can muster—is to harass the President.

Again, I say this gently, and I say this, hopefully, constructively to my friends in the House leadership: The House leadership needs to urinate or get off the pot. The House leadership needs to indict the President of the United States, impeach him, and let us hold a trial—he will not be convicted—or they need to go ahead and hold in contempt every single member of the Trump administration so we can move those issues into our court system and get back to doing the people's business.

Now, if they decide to go the court route, I would caution my friends to be very, very careful because once it enters the court system, it becomes a zero-sum game. One or two things are going to happen. Either the administration will win, in which case the oversight authority of the U.S. Congress will be undermined, or the House leadership will win, in which case no American with a brain above a single-cell organism is going to want to run for President of the United States, because Congress will be able to find out everything about your life, even the most intimate details, whether it is relevant to your job or not and whether it happened when you were President or not.

What I hope happens is that my friends in the House leadership and the administration sit down and talk—not talk like 8-year-olds in the back of a minivan fighting but talk constructively about how their behavior could impact important institutions in this country—and work it out.

I thank the Attorney General for making overtures to the House leadership to try to find common ground.

Now, let me talk about the Senate. We need to do more. I am not saying we haven't done anything. We have confirmed some very important nominees to the Trump administration. It is long overdue. They are fine men and women. We have confirmed some very fine men and women to the Federal Judiciary, and I believe they will make this country safer and will make this country better. I am very proud of that effort. So let me say it again. I am not saying we have done nothing. I am saying we need to do more.

There are issues where our Democratic friends and my Republican friends have more in common than we don't. We need to bring the bills to the floor of the Senate. Everyone has their own list, and everyone in the Senate knows what I am talking about, whether they will say it or not.

What is one of the things that moms and dads worry about when they lie down at night and can't sleep? The cost of prescription drugs. There is bipartisan support for prescription drug reform.

I just read a study in the Journal of the American Medical Association. They studied the U.S. healthcare delivery system and the healthcare delivery systems of all other wealthy countries. So it is apples to apples. In America, we pay about \$1,500 for every man, woman, or child every year for pharmaceutical drugs. In the average rich country, other countries pay \$750.

I am not criticizing our pharmaceutical drug companies. What they do is marvelous. We live longer. They save money. They keep us out of hospitals. But why is everybody else paying \$750 and our people are paying \$1,500? There are things we can do that will help make the pharmaceutical industry better but also help consumers. Do you know what we are doing about it? Nothing. We need to bring a bill to the floor.

I could give you another example. We all know there needs to be reform of our National Emergency Act. We know that. It is not about President Trump. It is about institutions, checks and balances, and Madisonian separation of powers.

We could do something together to get rid of spam robocalls. I get about 12 a day.

ROB PORTMAN has a great bill that would end government shutdowns. We have more in common on that than we don't.

We need a supplemental disaster bill. We have Americans who are hurting. In my State, after Katrina, we were flat on our backs. If it hadn't been for the American taxpayer, we would have never risen to our knees, much less to our feet. We have other Americans and friends in Puerto Rico who need help. We ought to be able to work it out.

I could keep going. Everybody has their own list.

I don't care whether we move a bill through committee or whether we bring a bill directly to the floor of the Senate—I am in labor, not management; that is above my pay grade—but we need to try. We need to try.

I understand it is an election cycle. I get that. I say to the Presiding Officer, I am a politician. You know that. But we are always in an election cycle. When are we not in an election cycle? And I understand some of my colleagues with a lot more experience than I have—and I listen carefully to them, and I try to listen carefully to them—are thinking right now: Kennedy, that is just not the way it is done here.

Well, by God, maybe it is not, but maybe it should be.

I know some of my friends are thinking: Kennedy, if we do that, we are taking too big of a political risk.

Maybe we are. Maybe we will win.

I just think that there are bills that will make the American people able to live better lives, and we ought to spend a little more time thinking about the next generation than the next election.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, the Washington Post published an important piece of investigative journalism. The journalists looked into a very narrow, very wealthy group of special interests seeking to control our Federal judiciary. It was a revealing story, one that matters a great deal to the Senate and to the people we serve. I come to the floor today to discuss that tightening special interest grip on our courts.

The central operative in this court-fixing scheme is Leonard Leo of the Federalist Society, the organization at the center of this effort. As I described here on the Senate floor several weeks ago, there are three incarnations of the Federalist Society.

The first is a debating society for conservatives at law schools. They convene panels and forums for like-minded, aspiring lawyers to talk about conservative ideas and judicial doctrine. That is all fine.

The second is a flashy Washington, DC, think tank. They attract big-name lawyers, scholars, and politicians—even Supreme Court Justices—to their events. They publish and podcast. They hold black tie galas. I don't agree with the work they do, but I don't question their right to do it.

The third Federalist Society is what was exposed in the Post article. It is something much, much darker, both in its funding and in its function. It is a vehicle for powerful interests seeking to "reorder" the judiciary under their control so as to benefit their corporate rightwing purposes. It seeks to accomplish by judicial power grab what the Republican Party has been unable to accomplish through the open Democratic process.

This third, dark Federalist Society understands the fundamental power through the Federal judiciary to rig the system in favor of special interests.

So what did the Post find out about how our judges on the most important courts in the country are selected? It found a network of front groups. It found shell entities with no employees.

It found shared post office mail drops, common contractors and officers across nominally separate entities, even common presidents of nominally separate entities. In these characteristics, it has some resemblance to money laundering and crime syndicates.

What else did they find? They found dark money funders, anonymous advertising, enormous pay packages for the operatives, and judicial lists prepared secretly. It found \$250 million in dark money flowing through this apparatus.

The story turns up familiar dark money political funders like the Mercers and the National Rifle Association, but it also exposes groups that are harder to spot, which may not have garnered much attention before but serve central functions in Leonard Leo's court-fixing apparatus.

A few weeks ago I delivered remarks on the Senate floor about the sweeping influence of Leonard Leo and the Federalist Society court-fixing scheme. I touched on one Federalist Society product of this scheme in particular: the newly confirmed DC Court of Appeals judge, Neomi Rao. I described some pretty straightforward facts about Rao. Her connection to the Federalist Society is no secret. Sitting on the DC Circuit right now, her bio still appears on the Federalist Society website along with the list of 26 times she has been featured—26 times she has been featured at Federalist Society events.

Before being nominated for one of the most influential courts in the country, which some call the second highest court in the land, she had never been a judge, she had never tried a case. Instead, she had served as the Trump administration's point person for helping big Republican donors tear down Federal safety regulations. She did this as the head of the White House's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA. That is not disputed.

Before that, she founded something provocatively called the Center for the Study of the Administrative State at George Mason University's Antonin Scalia Law School. Her center is a cog in Leonard Leo's machine.

Let's revisit Rao's testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee about the funding for the Center for the Study of the Administrative State. She testified that neither the Koch Foundation nor any anonymous donors had funded her center. Well, a trove of documents obtained by me, the New York Times, and others showed that was not true. A Virginia open records request had revealed that an anonymous donor funneling its dark money donation through Leonard Leo and the Charles Koch Foundation in fact donated \$30 million intended to flow to her organization, her Center for the Study of the Administrative State.

Well, my remarks drew quite a reaction. The center's current director took to Medium to post a 2,500-word rebuttal. He claimed I was all wrong about the center's funding—that none

of its money came from those anonymous and Koch brothers' donations.

The National Review jumped into the fray and noted the Medium post on its website. The nub of their criticism was that although I was right, the Scalia Law School had indeed received millions in anonymous and Koch brothers' money. That money had gone to fund scholarships, not to the anti-regulatory Center for the Study of the Administrative State.

Let's start by assuming that is true. I will tell you, if I gave \$30 million to my alma mater "for scholarships," I would expect a thank-you. I expect they would see a gift of \$30 million in scholarships as a benefit to the school. If they were asked "Has Senator WHITEHOUSE ever given you a gift?" I would expect them to say "Yes, he gave us a \$30 million scholarship fund." I might even expect a nice press release. So I don't buy the "this was just scholarships money" dodge around telling the truth to the Judiciary Committee.

But look a little more. In 2016, George Mason University, indeed, received a \$10 million donation from the Charles Koch Foundation and, indeed, did receive a \$20 million donation from an anonymous donor. Both gifts came with grant agreements, and these grant agreements were among the Virginia open records documents. So we can learn a little bit more.

The grant agreements stipulate that the money was intended to fund "scholarships" but also specify that gifts were conditioned on the school's providing "funding . . . and support for"—you guessed it—Neomi Rao's Center for the Study of the Administrative State.

That is not all we found. Private communications revealed with the grant agreements show that the Koch Foundation and their handpicked law school administrators viewed all of this money as fungible.

I earlier said that if I gave \$30 million, I might expect a press release. The Antonin Scalia Law School did a press release. Its announcement of this funding stated: "The scholarship money will also benefit the institution because it frees up resources that can be allocated for other priorities, including additional faculty hires and support for academic programs."

It didn't end there. The documents keep telling us more. They include a progress report—a progress report—to the Koch Foundation. Under the heading "most pressing needs," Dean Henry Butler wrote to the Koch Foundation: "Cash is King (scholarships are cash)." In that same memo to the Koch Foundation—which, by the way, is kind of a bizarre document to exist in the first place, unless this is kind of a front for Koch brothers' political activities—Dean Butler also made clear that Rao's center had indeed received hundreds of thousands in funding from an anonymous donor, just as I charged, and further made clear that Rao's center was

being funded with \$400,000 from “naming-gifts scholarship revenue”—the Koch brothers’ “scholarships” money that was earmarked for Neomi Rao’s center. It was being rerouted to fund Leonard Leo and Neomi Rao’s project to gut public protections in this country on behalf of those donors. The dark plot thickened.

Here is the most interesting part of all. The open records documents also show that the law school dean, Henry Butler, regularly reported to Leonard Leo on developments at Neomi Rao’s center, including faculty hiring and other Federalist Society priorities. The emails are very cozy. The dean is deferential. There is even a calendar entry for lunch at a Washington, DC, restaurant for Neomi Rao, Henry Butler, and Leonard Leo. Cozier still is that another condition of the Koch Foundation’s massive gift was that Henry Butler be protected as dean because they viewed him—specifically him—as “critical to advancing the school’s mission.” That mission? Doing the Koch Foundation and Leonard Leo’s bidding to help cripple public interest protections in this country for big special interests funding Leo, funding the center, and funding the Federalist Society.

Neomi Rao’s defenders were quick to push back on this point and argued that my criticisms of her center’s work was stifling their academic inquiry. They pointed to the center’s research roundtables and public policy conferences as evidence of its fair and independent academic bona fides.

Sorry, but it is tough to buy when, in one private fundraising email, Dean Butler was revealed to have asked one wealthy donor for a \$1.5 million gift “to entice Neomi [Rao] to return home to Scalia Law after she dismantles the administrative state.”

Tell me, who is the real threat to academic inquiry here?

Perhaps more to the point, now that she is a judge: Who is a present threat to judicial independence on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals?

Fancy lunches and weird, cozy relationships between public law school deans and DC power brokers can seem a bit in the weeds, so let’s not lose sight of the bigger picture here. This stuff matters because Americans are now seeing their courts fill with judges, like Neomi Rao, who are expected and chosen to reliably rule for big corporate and Republican partisan special interests—the ones funding the Federalist Society’s selection of these judges, the ones funding the Judicial Crisis Network’s confirmation of these judges, the ones funding Amici, the front group Amici that shows up to argue in court.

I recently looked at the numbers for the Federalist Society-dominated Supreme Court. Under Chief Justice Roberts’ tenure, through the end of the October term of 2017 to 2018, Republican appointees delivered partisan 5-to-4 rulings that favored corporate or Republican partisan special interests, not

three or four times, not even a dozen or two dozen times, but 73 times. If you look at the Court’s cases during Chief Justice Roberts’ tenure and look at the 5-to-4 decisions and look at the 5-to-4 decisions wherein the breakdown between the five and the four was partisan and look at those 5-to-4 partisan decisions, for the ones in which there was a clearly apparent, big Republican donor interest, you will find that every single one of those 73 decisions was won—was decided—in favor of the big Republican donor interest. There were 73 victories delivered for big Republican interests with there being no Democratic appointee who joined the majority.

Here is one case study—a recent decision after the 73. It is *Lamps Plus v. Varela*. The plaintiff, Frank Varela, sued his employer, Lamps Plus, after a company data breach led to a fraudulent tax return being filed in his name. An appellate court looked at the case and relied on a State contract principle to agree with plaintiff Varela. That is a traditionally conservative principle—deferring to State laws. Along came the Supreme Court in this case, and it ditched the conservative principle to rule in favor of the corporation in a 5-to-4 partisan decision.

There is another case study pending before the Court now—*Kisor v. Wilkie*. On its face, Kisor addresses an obscure administrative law doctrine about judicial deference to Federal Agencies, but Kisor has been described as a “stalking horse for much larger game.” The larger purpose is to strip away judicial deference to administrative Agencies’ capacity to regulate independently in the public’s interest.

You have to understand that if you are a mighty corporation, you come to an administrative Agency from a position of terrific advantage ordinarily, and where administrative Agencies are willing to stand up, that is important, but if you can get your judges on a court and strip away that deference, now you can put the fix in through the courts.

Imagine a world in which Federal Agencies get virtually no judicial deference and in which Leonard Leo’s special interest, handpicked judges rule on Americans’ disputes with big corporations. If these big special interests are sick of protections for workers in the workplace, let the judges get rid of them. Dismantle the administrative state. If a big special interest is sick of safeguards for our air and water or dangers in toys our children play with, dismantle the administrative state. Tear down the safety regulations. They will have the judges to do that. If corporations are sick of a guardrail that keeps our financial system from dragging down millions of Americans’ financial security, these judges stand ready to dismantle the administrative state that protects investors.

Leonard Leo’s dark Federalist Society element is installing judges who are poised to systematically and re-

lentlessly dismantle government Agencies that are sworn to keep us safe and secure.

How do you push back on this machine wherein the big-money special interests select a nominee by contributing to the Federalist Society and Leonard Leo’s secretive judicial lists and judge-picking process? They spend money campaigning for their selected judge’s confirmation through the Judicial Crisis Network. They then spend money through amicus briefs and argue before the judges on whom they have spent money to select and confirm. Sure enough—bingo—it is 73 to 0 in the important decisions in which they can get the Republican appointees to gang up in a group of five and deliver and deliver for the interests of the center of this, which you can’t properly identify because it is not transparent.

The Federalist Society doesn’t disclose its donors. The Judicial Crisis Network doesn’t disclose its donors. The Supreme Court rule doesn’t get at who the real donors are to this phony front group, Amici. You find out later on who the winners are—73 to nothing.

How do you push back on that machine? You push back with sunlight, with transparency. We must have transparency in our campaign finance system. We must have transparency in this special interest conveyor belt that is filling our courts. We should also have transparency in the courts. Right now, the dark money-funded front groups behind Leonard Leo and behind the Federalist Society’s judge-picking operation are probably also behind those amicus briefs. With a little transparency, we would know. It is through these amicus briefs that the judges who were selected and confirmed by these folks get instructed on how they should rule. This is a recipe for corruption.

The Court itself should require real transparency from so-called friends of the Court. These amicus groups come in under a Supreme Court rule. The Supreme Court rule only requires them to disclose who paid for the brief. Yet who is really behind the group? We don’t know. The Supreme Court could correct that. It could correct it like that, but then it would start to expose who is here.

If the Court will not, Congress must. Democracy dies in darkness, it has been said, and so does judicial independence. The American people deserve to know when powerful special interests are paying to sway Federal judges with self-serving legal advice. If those same interests paid to get those judges selected and paid to campaign for their confirmations and then paid to have the amicus briefs put before the Court, the need for the American people to understand what is going on becomes even more profound.

I close with a big thank-you to the Washington Post for its reporting. Thanks to its careful investigative work of its pouring through tax records and interviews, we now know a lot



more about the Federalist Society's court-fixing operation.

Our President likes to describe investigative journalism that pokes and probes at the mischief of his administration as fake news. There is nothing fake about this news. This is in the best traditions of investigative journalism, and I am grateful for its work to illustrate how our courts are being captured by corporations and runaway partisanship that is fueled by dark money.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Wisconsin.

#### HEALTHCARE

**Ms. BALDWIN.** Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the ongoing threat from the Trump administration to healthcare and the guaranteed protections that millions of American families depend upon.

President Trump has tried to pass repeal plans that would take people's healthcare away and allow insurance companies to charge more for people with preexisting health conditions or those insurance companies could deny them coverage altogether.

When that repeal plan failed to pass in the Senate in the summer of 2017, instead of working in a bipartisan way to lower healthcare costs, President Trump turned to truly sabotaging our healthcare system.

What do I mean by that?

The Trump administration made it harder for people to sign up for the Affordable Care Act coverage. They have done so by limiting the window of time when people can enroll. They have truly created instability in the healthcare market, and their sabotage has contributed to premium spikes that we have seen across the country, including in my home State of Wisconsin.

The Trump administration has even gone to court to support a lawsuit in order to overturn the Affordable Care Act completely, and that, of course, would include protections for people with preexisting health conditions. They have essentially gone into court to ask the court to strike down the Affordable Care Act. Now, if they were to succeed, insurance companies will again be able to deny coverage or charge much higher premiums for the more than 130 million Americans who have some sort of preexisting health condition. The number with preexisting health conditions includes some 2 million Wisconsinites.

What is the President's plan to protect people with preexisting health conditions? He doesn't have one, and I don't believe he ever will.

In fact, he has acted in just the opposite vein. This administration has expanded junk insurance plans that can deny coverage to people with preexisting conditions, and they don't have to cover essential services like prescription drugs or emergency room care or maternity care.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to think about this for a mo-

ment. President Trump supports overturning the law that provides protections for people with preexisting health conditions at the same time he is expanding these junk plans that don't provide those very protections. If this isn't straight-up sabotage, I really don't know what is.

When I was 9 years old, I got sick. I was really sick. I was in the hospital for 3 months. Now, I recovered, but my family still struggled because I had been branded with the words "pre-existing health condition" and I was denied insurance coverage.

That family and personal experience has driven my fight to make sure that every American has affordable and quality healthcare coverage.

Today, because of the Affordable Care Act, those with preexisting health conditions cannot be discriminated against. They can't be denied healthcare coverage, and they can't be charged discriminatory premiums.

I want to protect the guaranteed healthcare protections that so many millions of Americans now depend upon. I have introduced legislation along with my colleague Senator DOUG JONES of Alabama to overturn the Trump administration's expansion of junk insurance plans.

The entire Senate Democratic caucus, including the two Independents who caucus with us, have supported this legislation. They have signed on to this bill. The Nation's top healthcare organizations, representing tens of thousands of doctors and physicians, and patients and medical students, and other health experts have supported this legislation and endorsed it. Anyone who says they support healthcare coverage for people with preexisting conditions should support my legislation.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1556

**Mr. President,** as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1556; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** Reserving the right to object, this is the latest Democratic attempt to raise the cost of healthcare paid for out of your own pocket by taking away an ability to provide lower cost health insurance that preserves preexisting condition protection and the essential health benefits. These short-term health benefits were available under President Clinton. They were available under President Bush. They were available under President Obama right until the last few months of his office, when he cut them down to 3 months long.

President Trump has simply said that you may now have them up to a

year and renew them for 3 years. If you live in Fulton County, GA, your insurance costs will be 30 percent less against the typical ObamaCare bronze plan and even more against the silver plan.

This is the latest Democratic attempt to increase the cost of what you pay for healthcare out of your own pocket. Their next attempt will be Medicare for All, which, if you have health insurance on the job, will take that health insurance away.

I object.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

**Ms. BALDWIN.** Mr. President, I am certainly disappointed that my Republican colleagues have chosen to object to protecting people with preexisting conditions.

It is my contention that some of the very opposite impacts, because of these junk plans, are occurring than what my colleague has recited. In fact, I hardly consider them insurance plans. Many have argued that they are not worth the paper that they are written on. They don't cover many essential benefits. They are not required to cover people with preexisting health conditions. They can drop people. They can charge outrageous prices. What we found—and the reason that the Obama administration went from yearlong plans to 3-month plans—is that they saw the distortion in the markets. They saw that people who had believed that they might not get sick—healthy, often younger people—were availing themselves of these plans, making the Affordable Care—

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

**Ms. BALDWIN.** I would yield to one question, and then I want to wrap up my comments.

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, is the Senator of Wisconsin not aware that the short-term healthcare plans do not change the law of preexisting condition?

**Ms. BALDWIN.** Mr. President, these short-term plans do not have to cover preexisting conditions. I can tell you, as I have inquired—

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** Mr. President, may I—

**Ms. BALDWIN.** I yielded already for a question. But I want to say—

**Mr. ALEXANDER.** She gave the wrong answer, Mr. President.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

**Ms. BALDWIN.** It may not be to the Senator's liking, but I was going to tell you about the plans that I read the fine print on from the State of Wisconsin. Now that these short-term plans are renewable for up to 3 years, in these junk plans, you can see the fine print. Many times they start with this: We will not cover a preexisting condition. Every single one of them refuses to cover maternity care. That means none of these junk plans cover that essential benefit. Most of them don't cover

emergency room care. Most of them don't cover prescription drugs. So regardless of how the law impacts people who have other types of insurance, I feel strongly that these junk plans are very distorting of the market and not worth the paper they are written on for those who have chosen to take that route.

Last fall, we heard all my colleagues across the aisle say, often repeatedly, that they support protections for people with preexisting health conditions. Today I just offered an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to come together to protect people's access to quality, affordable healthcare when they need it the most, but there was an objection.

I say to the American people that we must not lose sight of the fight right in front of us. We have a President who time after time has sabotaged our healthcare system, raised healthcare costs, and pushed these junk insurance plans that don't have to cover people with preexisting conditions. We have an administration that is asking a court to strike down the Affordable Care Act and its protections for people with preexisting conditions in their entirety.

The choice for the American people could not be more clear. We want to make things better, and my Republican colleagues refuse to join us in this effort, which would be to prevent this administration from making things worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PROTECTING AMERICANS WITH PREEXISTING CONDITIONS ACT OF 2019

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the House recently passed a piece of legislation called the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act. The substance of this legislation would prevent a Trump administration rule from going into effect that would allow for States to license the kind of insurance plans that Senator BALDWIN was referring to. These are plans that do not cover preexisting conditions or the essential healthcare benefits.

I am going to offer right now a unanimous consent request to proceed to immediate consideration of this bill. I suspect it will be objected to. After an opportunity for Republicans to object, I will speak to the merits of this legislation. So let me start with a request to bring this legislation that will protect people with preexisting conditions and the essential healthcare benefits to the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 986

Mr. President, my motion is as such: As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 90, H.R. 986, Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, section 1332 is the innovation waiver that is part of the Affordable Care Act, passed by the Democratic majority. That act includes protection for preexisting conditions. Using the flexibility granted under section 1332 does not change anything about preexisting conditions. So it is misleading to the American people to suggest that it does.

This is another Democratic attempt to make it more expensive, to cost more for what you pay for healthcare out of your own pocket by taking away flexibility from the States to find a less expensive way for you to afford healthcare and, at the same time, not changing the preexisting condition protection that is provided by the Affordable Care Act. This is the latest attempt to do it, but the boldest attempt to raise the cost of your healthcare is Medicare for All, which if you have insurance on the job, as 181 million Americans do, would take that insurance away from you.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I share in Senator BALDWIN's disappointment that we can't move immediately to this legislation. This isn't a political game. These are individuals all across the country who are relying on us to make sure that they are not subject to the abuses of the market. They are relying on us to make sure we don't return to the days in which insurance companies could prevent you from getting healthcare simply because you were sick or return to the days when you bought an insurance product and then it didn't turn out to ultimately be insurance.

Let's be clear. The waiver that the President has allowed States to take advantage of would absolutely—it would by definition of the rule—allow for States to waive the preexisting condition requirement. The rule itself says that the innovation that happens at the State level does not have to comply with the essential healthcare benefits requirement. It says in the rule that you do not have to comply with preexisting conditions requirements. That is the reason that they are so cheap. So I am at a loss as to why we have Republicans on the floor saying that preexisting conditions will be protected under this rule. That is not true. The rule says that States do not have to comply with the preexisting requirement. It says that States do not have to cover essential healthcare benefits. That is why these junk plans are attractive, because they aren't actually insurance, and they are only insurance for people who are at the time very healthy.

We have to get on the same page here. We have to be reading from the same script. The fact of the matter is,

the definition of the rule allows for protections for people with preexisting conditions to be discriminated against.

I am sorry that we weren't able to bring up this piece of legislation because healthcare insurance should be healthcare insurance. And what we worry about are two things. First is that by allowing for the marketing of these junk plans, you are going to have all sorts of people who today aren't sick jumping into those plans, coming off of the plans that protect people with preexisting conditions. The people who are going to be left behind on those regulated plans are people who are sick, people who have preexisting conditions. So you are, all of a sudden, bifurcating the insurance market. You are going to have a market for people who are currently healthy, and then you are going to have a market for people who are sick or have ever had a preexisting condition.

You do not have to be an actuary and you don't have to have taken classes in healthcare insurance economics to know that when that happens, rates skyrocket for people who have a preexisting condition—for the millions of people around this country who have had a serious diagnosis at some point during their life.

So as you sell these junk plans, there is no way but for costs to go up. That is on top of the increases we saw last year. Last year, insurance companies priced in the costs of Trump administration sabotage. They priced into their premiums the attacks on our healthcare system from the Republican Congress.

In many States, we saw insurance plans pushing 60 percent, 40 percent, and, in some cases, 80 percent increases in premiums. Now on top of that, for sick people, for people with preexisting conditions, the rates are going to be even bigger because of the flight of those without preexisting conditions into marketplaces set up specifically for them.

The second thing we worry about is that these junk plans market themselves as insurance, but they aren't. Here is a list of things that I would generally consider to be covered under my insurance plan.

If I bought an insurance plan, if I handed over a check to the insurance company, I kind of think that if I go to the emergency room, I am not going to have to pay for it out of my pocket. I am thinking to myself: Well, you know what, if I need prescription drugs, they are going to cover some of that. Well, if I have a mental health diagnosis, doesn't insurance cover my head as well as the rest of my body?

These are the things that I would assume that insurance covers, but these junk plans don't cover these things.

Junk plans do not cover trips to the emergency room. Junk plans often don't cover hospitalizations. They don't cover prescription drugs. Almost none of them cover maternity care. Your checkups might not be covered

under a junk plan. Preexisting conditions will cost you more. Contraception isn't going to be in lots of these plans. They are not required to cover lab services or pediatrics. Mental health isn't going to be in many of these junk plans. As for rehab services, if you get injured, you are not going to find those in some of these plans. And if you have a chronic disease, there is nothing in the law that requires treatment for those to be covered.

So all of a sudden, as for the things you thought insurance covered, they don't cover it, and you have been paying a premium for years. Then, when you finally need access to the system, it is not there. That is what these plans can do. That is what the law and the Trump administration rule allows States to license as insurance. And that is why we are on the floor today, to ask—to plead—to our colleagues to bring legislation before this body, either Senator BALDWIN's legislation or Representative KUSTER's legislation that has already passed the House, that would stop these junk insurance plans from being sold all around this country, which will trick many Americans into believing they have insurance when they don't and will dramatically raise the cost of care potentially in many States for people who have serious preexisting conditions.

I am not surprised at the objection to both of our unanimous consent requests. Nevertheless, I am disappointed in it. We will continue to be down here on the floor for as much time as it takes to try to rally the whole of this body to protect people with preexisting conditions, to fight back against the sabotage of the Affordable Care Act and the healthcare system by this President. Hopefully, one day we will be successful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am proud to be here on the floor today to join with Senator BALDWIN and Senator JONES on their resolution with Senator MURPHY. I have to say to Senator MURPHY, before he puts that down, I have to look at that list and tell you that, before the Affordable Care Act, I would get calls like this, and I am sure you did, too.

Someone calls me and would say: I paid into healthcare all my life and never gotten sick, and then I finally needed surgery. What do you mean it only pays for 1 day in the hospital? Well, it never paid for more than 1 day in the hospital, but they didn't know it because they didn't get sick.

So folks buy the junk plans—and thank you for the list—but they buy the junk plan being healthy and then will never know that it doesn't cover those things unless they get sick. When they find out, it will be too late.

So that is why we are here because we know that healthcare isn't political. It shouldn't be political. It is personal for every one of us. It is personal

for ourselves and our families. It affects all of us, whether we are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, vote, don't vote, urban, rural from any State in the Union.

In fact, when people tell me their healthcare stories, they don't start by telling me their political affiliation. They talk to me about what has happened to them, what has happened to their mom and dad, what has happened to their children. Political affiliation doesn't matter.

People in Michigan simply want to know that the healthcare they depend on will be there for them and be affordable for them and their family today and into the future, and that is the fight that we have as Democrats. We will continue that fight.

Unfortunately, they have reason to be worried about the rise of short-term, limited duration insurance plans. They should be worried about what these plans don't cover—junk plans, as we are calling them. As Senator BALDWIN said so well, they are junk. They don't really cover anything. They make you feel good, as long as you are healthy, that you have got insurance, but then you find out, when you get sick, that your child is not covered or you are not covered.

The fact many of these plans are medically unwritten, which means that the insurance company—by the way, junk plans are about putting decisions back in the hands of the insurance company, instead of you knowing that you and your doctor can decide what you need and that it will be covered. The insurance companies can charge whatever they want based on somebody's health, gender, age, or other status.

Remember when being a woman was considered a preexisting condition? I do. These plans are bringing that back. One recent study found that none of these plans that have been approved by the Trump administration so far cover maternity care—none of them. We fought hard—I fought hard—as a member of the Finance Committee to make sure that women's healthcare and maternity care were covered. Our healthcare is as basic a healthcare as any man's healthcare and ought to be covered the same.

I want to repeat this. We have a maternal health crisis in this country, and the administration is pushing plans that don't cover basic coverage for women. On top of that, these junk plans can exclude people with preexisting conditions—yes, they can—and impose yearly or lifetime caps on care.

Remember when you had to worry about how many cancer treatments the insurance company would pay for? Now, there aren't caps so that you can decide and your doctor can decide with you on what it takes to put you in remission and put you on a healthy path. It is estimated about half of Michigan families include somebody with a preexisting condition—about half—with everything from heart disease to asth-

ma to arthritis. I met with some of them earlier this month during the National Brain Tumor Society's Head to the Hill event.

Tiffany, who is from Livonia, was just 17 years old when she was diagnosed with a brain tumor. Since then, her tumor has reoccurred six times. She has been through seven surgeries, chemotherapy, and radiation treatments. The location of her tumor means that Tiffany has also lost some of the use of her left arm and hand. Tiffany doesn't have a choice. Her life depends on having comprehensive health insurance. Unfortunately, that kind of insurance is getting less and less affordable.

So when our Republican colleagues come to the floor and say that we just want to raise prices, let me tell you what has really happened in the last year. The sabotage by the Trump administration, the unravelling of the Affordable Care Act, the junk plans, now the instability and going into court to try to totally repeal the Affordable Care Act, all of that instability—everything that has been done—means that comprehensive health insurance costs have gone up 16.6 percent this year, so somebody buying insurance is paying an average 16.6 percent more than they did last year because of all of this effort to sabotage, undermine, and unravel the healthcare system.

Tiffany should be able to focus on getting the treatment she needs and living her best life possible, not how she will pay for the insurance she needs. We all know Tiffany isn't alone. It is estimated that 130 million people in our country are living with preexisting conditions—130 million people. That is 130 million people who could be hurt either directly or indirectly by these short-term junk plans.

Two weeks ago, I had the chance to speak at the Detroit Race for the Cure, which raises money for breast cancer research and services. As I stood on the stage and looked out at over 10,000 people, a lot of beautiful pink all surrounding us in downtown Detroit, I saw people with preexisting conditions. One woman, who was standing on the stage near me, asked me the question: Why is it that I have to worry about whether or not I will be able to get insurance in the future? Why do I have to worry about that?

She added: Why don't President Trump and other Republicans understand this is my life?

It is not political for her. It is personal. It is her life. I think that is a very good question: Why don't Republicans understand that people like Tiffany and those women in pink deserve healthcare protections?

Protecting people with preexisting conditions isn't about politics. It is about saving lives. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation and the efforts of Senator BALDWIN and JONES.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. President, I want to take an additional moment to talk about a second issue that is about saving lives.

For almost 25 years, the Violence Against Women Act has helped prevent domestic violence and provide survivors with the things they need to build a better life for themselves and their families. This important piece of legislation is now expired.

The House passed a VAWA—Violence Against Women's Reauthorization bill 48 days ago and sent it to us. It contained important updates to protect people from violent dating partners and stalkers, and it helps restore Tribal jurisdiction over certain crimes committed on Tribal lands.

Unfortunately, just as in the case of junk insurance plans, we have seen no action on this floor—no action—by the majority leader. I think, in fact, it has been over 2 months since we have had actual legislation and votes on legislation that would solve problems and address concerns of the American people. It has been 48 days since the House of Representatives sent us a bill to continue support and funding for domestic violence shelters and other important support.

Well, people with preexisting conditions have waited long enough. Survivors of domestic violence have waited long enough. People whose lives are being threatened by violent dating partners or stalkers have waited long enough.

Here is my question for the Senate majority leader: What are you waiting for?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

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

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

Mr. BURR. I ask unanimous consent that we start the 4:30 votes now.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Ex.]

## YEAS—51

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

## NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Cooms	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen R. Clark, Sr., of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Clark nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

## YEAS—53

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

## NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Cooms	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Carl J. Nichols, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nichols nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

This is a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

## YEAS—55

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

## NAYS—43

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

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris	Tillis
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth D. Bell, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bell nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

## YEAS—55

Alexander	Braun	Cornyn
Barrasso	Burr	Cotton
Blackburn	Capito	Cramer
Blunt	Cassidy	Crapo
Boozman	Collins	Cruz

Daines	Kennedy	Rounds
Enzi	Lankford	Rubio
Ernst	Lee	Sasse
Fischer	Manchin	Scott (FL)
Gardner	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Graham	McSally	Shelby
Grassley	Moran	Sinema
Hawley	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hoeben	Paul	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Toomey
Inhofe	Portman	Wicker
Isakson	Risch	Young
Johnson	Roberts	
Jones	Romney	

## NAYS—43

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

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris	Tillis
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.  
The Senator from Ohio.

## TRADE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about international trade. It is a very complex issue, but also a really important issue to our country. Our goal with trade should be pretty simple: It is to level the playing field for America's workers, America's farmers, and America's businesses.

One, we have got to be sure they are not hurt by unfair imports coming into our country, so that is really a fairness issue and a trade enforcement issue.

Second, we should expand our exports. Opening up more foreign markets to our products is great for America. That is the balance. As a trade lawyer and as the U.S. Trade Representative in the George W. Bush administration and as a member of the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over these issues, I have worked on the trade matters quite a bit. It is really important to my home State.

Ohio has products that are manufactured by workers and crops grown by our farmers that are shipped all around the world. In fact, in Ohio, 1 of every 3 acres is now planted for export. So our farmers are dependent on trade, and 25 percent of our factory workers—manufacturing workers—have their jobs because of exports. Twenty-five percent is a big part of our manufacturing economy.

These jobs aren't just good for Ohio's economy. They are great for the people that have them. Trade jobs pay, on average, 16 percent more than other jobs, and they have better benefits, so we want more of these jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's population living outside of our country, we want to sell more of our stuff to the rest of the world to continue to grow and maximize the potential of our economy. So in my State and a lot of

others, manufacturing and ag jobs that are the bedrock of our economy depend on balanced trade. That goes for our trading partners around the world, but particularly for our two biggest neighbors: Mexico and Canada. They are, by far, Ohio's biggest trading partners.

Since 1994, we have linked our economy to Mexico and Canada in the form of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. In 2018, Ohio shipped 39 percent of our exports to Canada, more than twice the national average. Along with our trade with Mexico, this accounted for \$20 billion in trade. In all, trade with Mexico and Canada now supports 450,000 jobs in Ohio. So it is important.

We all know that the existing agreement—again, called NAFTA—has to be updated. It is 26 years old. It needs to be modernized. It needs to be improved. We need to be sure that we are doing a better job of leveling that playing field that we talked about and be sure that we are reflecting the nature of the 21st century economy.

Think about it. Back when NAFTA was negotiated, there was no digital economy. So we need to have new rules with regard to digital economy, as we do in our more recent trade agreements.

Also, as an example, there were no biologics. So we have no protections in the NAFTA agreement for biological pharmaceuticals. Of course, we need to have that in the new agreement, but it is more than that. Labor standards and environmental standards that have been in all of the more recent trade agreements need to be incorporated into the NAFTA agreement. There are lots of reasons for us to update the North American Free Trade Agreement and to improve it. Although no trade agreement is perfect, the new USMCA does those things.

By the way, according to a recent study by the Independent Trade Commission, the new USMCA, which is used to replace NAFTA, is estimated to raise wages and add 176,000 jobs to the U.S. economy. That is good. I support this U.S.-Canada agreement, or USMCA.

Last week, President Trump and his administration took a major step toward realizing the USMCA by announcing they would be lifting the so-called section 232 steel tariffs on steel and aluminum coming from Mexico and Canada. This is really good news. It is something I had advocated for, as had others, in order for us to pass the USMCA here but also to be sure that other countries—Canada and Mexico—could ratify the USMCA.

It ends the retaliation by Mexico and Canada on Made in Ohio exports to our northern and southern neighbors. This was really starting to bite in my home State and around the country.

By the way, it also protects against import surges and transshipments, particularly with regard to steel and aluminum. We worry about transshipments coming from China into

countries like Mexico and Canada and then being shipped or sneaked into the United States. You don't want that. That protection is in there as well. I think this was a good agreement.

Tariffs, especially on our allies, ought to be something we try to avoid—used tactically, sparingly, and targeted as to when we are going to use them.

There has been a lot of talk recently about the use of these section 232 tariffs by the administration not just on steel and aluminum but also with regard to automobiles and auto parts. Section 232, the law that this will be done under, is really an exception to our trade laws. Our trade laws say that if you unfairly trade with us—in other words, if you subsidize your products overseas or if you dump them, meaning, you sell them below their cost—then that is illegal, and we get to retaliate by adding tariffs to your product.

We also have laws that say if there is an import surge that domestic industries are substantially harmed by, that is a time for us to step up. But our other trade laws require one of those two things: either a finding of injury to a U.S. industry or some kind of unfair trade.

Under section 232, which is an exception to that, you don't have to do that. You can block imports simply by saying it is a national security issue.

It is a pretty powerful thing that the executive branch has, but it has been used very infrequently, and that is how Congress intended it. Congress intended it just to be used for true national security purposes.

The agency in charge of investigating these 232 tariffs is the Commerce Department. A recent Commerce Department investigation concluded that imported automobiles under the 232 criteria would be a national security threat. I think that is not accurate. I think minivans from Canada, as an example, aren't a national security threat to us. It may be that if they are unfairly traded, then we should enforce our trade laws. It may be that if there is an import surge that hurts our domestic industry, then go after them. But I think to use this tool in that sort of way is not appropriate.

That is why, over the past 50 years since this has been in effect, the section 232 tool has been used only a few times. In fact, it hasn't been used in the last 33 years.

One President tried to use it—George W. Bush, for whom I worked—and his Commerce Department said: You know, that is not a national security issue. So he used another trade provision that, again, required that you showed material injury to a domestic industry. That is the 232 issue.

I think it is important to have the tool. I think if it is a true national security concern, it is good to have it in the toolbox, and we ought to be able to use it. But we have to be judicious about it and not misuse it.

One reason to be careful is if you were to impose tariffs on cars and automobiles, as the Commerce Department has said you could do, it would really cost U.S. consumers and businesses.

First, on average, U.S. cars would cost about \$2,000 more, and I am told that is a conservative estimate. We don't want that.

Second, if you put these 232 tariffs on cars and auto parts with no fairness rationale, the retaliatory tariffs on our exports would be swift and painful.

Finally, if you misuse this 232 tool, I think you risk losing it altogether.

The World Trade Organization might not have too much influence these days, but they do have the ability to say whether something is legal under international trade rules. They have an exception for these national security waivers, but not if they are misused. So I think we have to be careful about how we use it.

President Trump and his administration made a decision over the last several days that I applaud them for. They decided not to move forward on these 232 tariffs against auto parts and automobiles. They decided to put it off for 6 months. I commend them for that.

Again, I hope we would never go there, but I think it is really important that we put that off for 6 months so that we can get not just the U.S.-Canada-Mexico agreement accomplished but so that we can also focus on other things, specifically, our issues with China.

I recently introduced a bipartisan bill on section 232. It is a commonsense approach that says: Let's be sure we are going under the original intent of section 232, that we are not misusing it. It is really simple. It says that instead of having the Department of Commerce make the decision, it should be the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense has the expertise to determine whether something is a national security issue.

With regard to the recent decisions on these 232 tariffs, the Department of Defense did not agree with the Commerce Department and thought that it was not a national security concern. They said that explicitly with regard to steel and aluminum, as examples. I just think the men and women who are hired to protect our country ought to be the ones who decide whether that is a national security threat.

Second, our legislation increases Congress's oversight here and allows for Congress to have an expanded role, to provide a legislative path for Congress to disapprove one of these 232 tariffs decisions if we think it is the wrong way to go. I think it is important to bring some of the power back to Congress, where it resides in the Constitution.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will help us with this commonsense legislation and avoid the misuse of section 232 on issues like autos and auto parts.

Again, in the meantime, the administration has made the right choice by delaying the imposition of these 232 tariffs on longtime allies with regard to autos and auto parts.

As I said earlier, balanced trade is about enforcement, being sure that it is fair in terms of what imports are coming into this country for our workers, for our farmers, and for our service providers.

It is also about exports. Do you know what? Because of that goal of balanced trade, I support what the Trump administration is doing vis-a-vis China. Unfortunately, when you look at what has happened to our relationship with China, we have more and more reasons to say that China is not playing by the rules.

China needs to make structural changes in our trade relationship in order for us to have that level playing field we talked about earlier. Right now, this U.S.-China economic relationship lacks equity, balance, and fairness. It also lacks durability.

The big trade deficits and the structural problems we have can't last. To put it simply, China is not playing by the rules.

First, they unfairly subsidized their exports. We talked about this earlier, but it is not fair for another country to say "We are going to use government money to subsidize what we send to the United States," and then have our workers and our farmers have to compete with that. Subsidies are unfair under international rules and under our trade laws.

China does it in a number of ways. One, they have a bunch of State-owned enterprises, and they have actually expanded their State-owned enterprises at a time when it looked as though China was going the other way, that they were going to have a more market-based economy, where the government wouldn't be controlling industries. But they have also committed massive subsidies to some of their favorite industries, companies, and technologies.

Second, China doesn't grant reciprocal access to U.S. investors and engages in coerced technology transfer in intellectual property theft from U.S. companies. Often, that intellectual property or technology then goes to a Chinese company.

To be clear, as a condition of doing business in the huge Chinese market, U.S. companies regularly have to hand over their intellectual property, their technology, and their innovations, like manufacturing processes, let's say, or blueprints, designs, trade secrets, and other things of value. Then, typically, a Chinese competitor uses these advantages to compete against U.S. companies. Again, that is just not acceptable.

I encourage you to check out the administration's section 301 report on USTR.gov. Go on USTR.gov, and you will see the section 301 issues that are laid out in that report. If you want to learn more about it, it is pretty clear.



Let me give you an example of how this technology transfer works. If a U.S. automaker wants to make cars in China—and a lot of them have wanted to and have made them there—China requires joint ventures in order to gain access to production technology that then helps foster China's own domestic auto industry.

In a number of businesses, China requires a 51-percent Chinese partner in a joint venture. Again, that is one way that technology transfer happens.

At first, China's foreign investment catalogue encouraged—that was the word—foreign auto investment. I was in China back in 1984, I believe it was—maybe 1985—at a Jeep plant. And I watched the first American vehicles go off the production line in China. I was there. I saw it. It was very positive. People were thinking: This is interesting. We are going to do business with China. Those Jeeps can then be sold in China and sold in other parts of Asia. It wasn't going to compete with the U.S. market. This was good for Jeep and good for China. That was at a time when they were encouraging foreign auto investment. But as China learned about auto manufacturing from these investments—in other words, they got knowledge about how to manufacture automobiles themselves—the foreign investment catalogue changed its position on auto investment from “encouraged” to “permitted” and then, more recently, in 2015, to “restricted.”

Again, this is an evolution, initially, bringing in a joint venture partner and getting the technology. It goes from “encouraged” to “permitted” and then finally to “restricted” now that China has that technology. That is kind of leapfrogging us, isn't it? Again, that doesn't seem fair, and it certainly is not reciprocal because we don't do the same thing here in this country.

This problem of fueling Chinese innovation with the hard work of U.S. companies is even more pronounced in the electric vehicle sector. There, China tries to incentivize the production of vehicles in China rather than imports from overseas. We would love to sell American electric cars in China, but they prevent this with a combination of things: tariffs, which are relatively high; subsidies for domestically produced electric cars; and a credit system that requires all automakers selling in China to produce a portion of their electric vehicles in China or face penalties. Again, we don't do that.

It is clear from this experience that China's unfair trade practices are at odds with the current rules-based, multilateral trading system.

I will continue to support the administration's efforts to increase pressure on China in order to reach a strong but fair and enforceable agreement. I argue that this is in China's interest, as well as in our interest. They are now a mature trading partner. They are now the greatest exporter in the world. They have an economy that is growing—

again, more sophisticated, more technology. They should want to protect their own intellectual property. They should want to be engaging with us and other countries around the world on a more fair basis.

While I urge the United States to hang tough, the administration should work quickly to try to bring these negotiations to a close because a combination of the retaliatory tariffs on U.S. exports and tariffs on Chinese consumer products here in America is causing pain for our farmers, for our workers, and for our service providers. So it would be good to bring these negotiations to a conclusion.

We were very close to doing that only a few weeks ago, and the reports back were that China had changed its view on some of the concessions they were willing to make. Let's get back to the table, and let's make a fair and enforceable agreement.

As part of increasing pressure on China, as the new tariff increases are designed to do, the United States must also better leverage our allies. The European Union, Japan, Korea, Canada, Australia, not to mention Vietnam and lots of other countries in Southeast Asia—all share our concerns that the administration has raised with regard to China. They are all experiencing the same thing. Leveraging our allies helps put pressure on China by demonstrating the broad consensus that exists among those who believe China often acts contrary to our rules-based, multilateral trading system.

When I was U.S. Trade Representative, I laid the groundwork for a number of successful World Trade Organization complaints against China by working with our allies. Key to our victory in those cases was our ability to rally and to kind of come up with a posse—the EU, Canada, Mexico, Japan, and other countries—to show China that the world was watching and cared. The administration's work with the EU and Japan on WTO reform and subsidies, right now, is a good step in the right direction. It shows how much is possible when we can rely on our friends and, therefore, gain more leverage. It is why it is important we don't adopt policies that actively undermine our ability to work with allies also.

That is another reason I was glad to see the administration delay any tariffs pursuant to this 232 we talked about on automobiles and auto parts. A lot of those 232 tariffs would have been imposed on our allies. Not only do autos and auto parts from our allies or anywhere else in the world not threaten our national security, but it also invites retaliation on U.S. exports and poisons the well of good will we need with our historic allies as we pursue a resolution of our differences with China.

Let me end where we started—about balanced trade. All America needs is a level playing field. We can compete. We have the ability to innovate. We have the ability to be flexible. We have a lot

of advantages in this country, but we do need a level playing field. All we ask for is fair and reciprocal treatment from our trading partners. The sweet spot for America is that balanced approach—again, opening up new markets for U.S. products while insisting on trade enforcement so that our workers can compete.

As we talked about today, right now, we have a lot of balls in the air in relation to trade. This has caused some uncertainty among our trading partners, with American businesses, workers, and farmers that rely on trade. I get that.

Let's prioritize passing USMCA with Canada and Mexico. That will provide some certainty. Let's support the administration in bringing home a strong agreement with China. That will provide a lot of certainty. And let's not impose new section 232 tariffs. That will also provide some certainty and predictability.

With that predictability and certainty further leveling the playing field, we can help American farmers, American workers, American businesses, and our economy.

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

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

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2019

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

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

#### IRAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, many of us are increasingly concerned that, since President Trump's reckless decision to abandon the multilateral nuclear agreement with Iran, which by all accounts Iran had been complying with, the administration has been on a collision course that could draw us into a war with Iran. Although the President insists that is not what he wants, he is known to change his mind on a whim, and the statements and actions of others in his administration, including some who were vocal proponents of the unnecessary and costly war in Iraq, leave little doubt that they favor a policy of regime change.

We all deplore Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, its horrific violations of human rights, and its constant outpouring of hateful

anti-American, anti-Israel rhetoric, but a war with Iran would be far worse, and no one can be certain how it would end. As tensions increase, a misunderstanding or provocative act by either Iran or the United States could quickly trigger retaliatory strikes that spiral out of control, drawing us, our allies, and our adversaries into protracted hostilities. Rather than risk that potentially disastrous result, the administration should be partnering with our European and Middle Eastern allies on a strategy of negotiations to reduce regional tensions. In that regard, I ask unanimous consent that a recent op-ed in "The Guardian" by Peter Westmacott, former British Ambassador to the United States, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Guardian, May 21, 2019]

TO DEFUSE THIS CRISIS THE US MUST START  
TALKING TO IRAN

(By Peter Westmacott)

As Washington raises the stakes, the risk of a misunderstanding is high—and it could lead to a new conflict in the Middle East.

Washington's foreign policy hawks—and by extension for the rest of us. Donald Trump says he doesn't want a war with Iran, but his national security adviser, J. John Bolton, has despatched warships and bombers to the region while the US secretary of state Mike Pompeo has been sharing worrying intelligence about Iranian intentions with close allies and congressional leaders.

What's going on? It's now a year since Trump tore up the nuclear deal with Iran negotiated in 2015 by the Obama administration along with Britain, France, Germany, Russia, China and the EU. Since then, egged on by Israel and the Gulf states, he has announced new sanctions, despite Iran's full compliance with the terms of the deal, and tried bullying the Europeans and others into applying US sanctions in order to deny Iranians the economic benefits they were promised.

After a year of waiting to see if the other signatories would make the deal work without US cooperation, the Iranians announced earlier this month that they would no longer fully comply with the uranium and heavy water restrictions of the agreement—and that, unless the Europeans could help with oil and banking within 60 days, more drastic measures would follow. Western governments sometimes forget that the Iranian government is not a monolithic entity, and that the officials they are used to dealing with, such as president Hassan Rouhani and foreign minister Javad Zarif, are under constant pressure from hardliners who point to the lack of any return on the investment Iran made four years ago.

Since Trump pulled the plug, the Europeans have been working on a scheme to allow some forms of trade with Iran to continue independently of the US. Its effects have been limited, leading the supreme leader, Ali Khamenei, to convince himself—wrongly—that the Europeans were only ever playing good cop to Washington's bad cop. As US sanctions continue to damage the Iranian economy, Trump says he is still interested in some kind of grand bargain. Tehran should call me, the president says, perhaps not realising that there would be huge political consequences for anyone who did.

But outside the US, the impression has grown that the hawks in the Trump adminis-

tration are more interested in regime change than in policy change—and by military action if necessary. There are shades here of Iraq 2003, when the George W Bush administration was desperate to prove that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. It is nonsense to claim, as Pompeo did last month, that "there is a connection between the Islamic Republic of Iran and al-Qaida. Period. Full stop". Al-Qaida's roots are in Sunni, Wahhabist Saudi Arabia, and it hates Shia Iran almost as much as it hates the US and its allies.

The Europeans have never disagreed about the nature or extent of Iran's destabilising activity in the region. But they don't buy the regime change argument, knowing from experience that outside pressure is more likely to strengthen rather than weaken the hardliners. They also still believe that the best way to prevent Iran acquiring nuclear weapons is to stick with the deal.

There is now a real risk of the world finding itself with another Middle Eastern conflict on its hands, by accident or miscalculation. What can be done? As many of us have been saying to Iranian officials for some time, they should help others to stand up for the nuclear deal by moderating Iran's behaviour in the region: stop supplying sophisticated weaponry to Hezbollah in Lebanon; and stop supplying missiles to the Houthi militia in Yemen that perpetuate the horrific civil war. Iran could use its influence over President Bashar al-Assad to press him to avoid further bloodshed in Syria. And it could end the imprisonment and abuse of dual nationals and other Iranian citizens on specious grounds.

Some suggest that current tensions may be partly the result of misunderstandings between Tehran and Washington. That wouldn't be surprising, given the long history of distrust and the absence of diplomatic relations between the two countries for 40 years. But it serves as a reminder that some form of direct communication is essential: both sides should move quickly to activate private channels.

Back in 1987—when the UN security council was trying to stop the Iran-Iraq war Saddam had started (with western encouragement) seven years earlier—the council passed a resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire and a withdrawal to international borders. It didn't manage to stop Saddam launching another, ultimately unsuccessful offensive. But tucked away in paragraph eight was a request to the secretary general "to examine, in consultation with Iran and Iraq and with other states in the region, measures to enhance the security of the region".

That resolution is still valid. Why not look again at the idea of all the regional powers, under UN auspices, coming together with a view to lowering tensions? A recent OpEd in the New York Times by Abdulaziz Sager, a Saudi Arabian academic, and Hussein Moussavian, a former Iranian nuclear negotiator, argues that the time for the region's two big rivals to sit down and try to bury the hatchet might just have come. So much is at stake that it's surely worth a try.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN PAUL STEVENS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been nearly a decade since Justice John Paul Stevens retired from the Supreme Court. His absence on the bench is perhaps felt more now than ever. Justice Stevens' nomination was the first of 18 Supreme Court nominees I have considered in my years in the Senate. As a young Senator, it was a

privilege to support his confirmation in 1975. It was a vote I have long been proud of. Justice Stevens had a storied tenure on the Supreme Court and ultimately became the third longest serving Justice in our Nation's history.

Justice Stevens' commitment to the law and conduct on the bench was beyond reproach. His legacy is one of integrity, dedication to public service, and a recognition that the Constitution protects all Americans equally. He was part of majorities that protected LGBT rights, disability rights, and limited the death penalty.

The Supreme Court has never been perfect. Justice Stevens would be the first to acknowledge as much, but I cannot help but compare his many years on the Court with today. Today, the Supreme Court almost reflexively sides with corporate interests over individuals' interests, even when precedent or so-called textualism and originalism stand in the way. We have also seen an unprecedented blockade of a Supreme Court nominee, and we have a President intent on nominating the most ideological nominees to the bench I have ever seen, nominees who have been preapproved by opaque far-right special interest groups. Many of these nominees have long records of outright hostility toward reproductive rights, environmental protections, and voting and civil rights. They even refuse to accept that *Brown v. Board of Education*, a foundational civil rights decision settled 65 years ago, is indeed settled law. It is equally predictable and deeply unfortunate that Americans increasingly view the courts as a purely political institution.

Our Constitution and laws are intended to serve the people, protecting the freedom of individuals from the tyranny of government and helping to organize our society for the good of all. It is up to the judiciary to ensure our laws have meaning. This is a duty Justice Stevens' recognized and relished.

How I miss his jurisprudence, his steady voice, and his leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that a May 11, 2019, feature by Robert Barnes from The Washington Post entitled, "John Paul Stevens looks back on nearly a century of life and law, but worries about the future," be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 2019]

JOHN PAUL STEVENS LOOKS BACK ON NEARLY  
A CENTURY OF LIFE AND LAW, BUT WORRIES  
ABOUT THE FUTURE

(By Robert Barnes)

FORT LAUDERDALE, FL.—John Paul Stevens spent more than a third of his near-century on Earth at the Supreme Court, where he often was on a different page from a majority of his fellow justices.

"It happens so often that you have to get used to losing," Stevens, 99, said during an interview this last week at his condominium here, just steps from the Atlantic Ocean. "My batting average was probably pretty low."

But one particular loss lingers and, Stevens says, brings grim reminders almost weekly: the court's 2008 decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, which found the Second Amendment protects a right to individual gun ownership unrelated to possible military service.

"Unquestionably the most clearly incorrect decision that the Court announced during my tenure on the bench," Stevens writes in his new memoir, "The Making of a Justice."

*Heller* and the Second Amendment, Stevens said in the interview, produce "such disastrous practical effects. I think there's no need for all the guns we have in the country and if I could get rid of one thing it would be to get rid of that whole gun climate."

He continued: "Just the other day there was another school shooting in Colorado, and every time it happens, it seems to me we don't have to have this kind of thing in this country, and we should do everything we can to try to change it."

Stevens writes of his efforts to try to make the 5-to-4 decision come out the other way. His 531-page book, to be published Tuesday, details the life and career of a World War II Navy code-breaker from a solidly Republican family, nominated to the federal bench by one GOP president (Richard M. Nixon) and elevated to the Supreme Court by another (Gerald R. Ford) who retired in 2010 as the court's most outspoken liberal. Although, Stevens believes the court changed more than he did.

In the interview, he expressed generalized distress at the state of the world and the nation's politics. "You wake up in the morning and you wonder what's happened," he said. Still, he retains a judge's reticence even years after leaving the bench: "But I shouldn't say more."

He does wonder why it is so challenging for his former colleagues to recognize that partisan gerrymandering is a constitutional violation, as they do with racial gerrymandering. "It's the same issue," he said. "Public officials, including state legislators, have a duty to act impartially. The whole point [of partisan gerrymandering] is to create an unfair result."

And he expressed surprise about Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr., whom he respects and admires, "I must confess he's more conservative than I realized," Stevens said. "But that doesn't go to his quality as a chief justice."

During the interview, Stevens was preparing for a reunion of his clerks—more than 90 of 125 were expected to attend. He must steady himself with a walker, but he remains active. Tennis has been replaced by ping-pong, he said, but he still plays nine holes of golf each week.

"I don't go in the ocean as much as I used to, and that's really my favorite activity down here," he said. "A strong guy" to help him in and out of the surf is now "an absolute necessity," he said.

It is hard to imagine that at his 1975 confirmation hearing, soon after he became one of the first to receive a heart bypass operation, the main obstacle was "did I have a sufficient life expectancy to justify the important appointment," he writes. He was approved unanimously. The memoir is a tale of a privileged childhood in Chicago, the ravages of the Great Depression and a family scandal, service as a wartime cryptologist and a charmed legal career as a Supreme Court clerk, appeals court judge and the third-longest-serving justice in the court's history.

Stevens was in the stands at Wrigley Field in Chicago when Babe Ruth called his shot in the 1932 World Series—"my most important

claim to fame," he writes—and in the audience at the Democratic National Convention that summer when Franklin D. Roosevelt explained the New Deal on his way to becoming president. His father, Ernest, who took Stevens to the speech, was a Warren Harding Republican, however.

Amelia Earhart told him he was out too late for a school night when she attended the grand opening of the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, at the time the largest in the world. Charles Lindbergh passed along a caged dove someone had given him. On a trip to the South, Stevens and his family attended "Gone With The Wind" the week it in opened in Atlanta.

The invitations that come to a Supreme Court justice provide other celebrity tidbits. He was as smitten as others when he met Princess Diana, and an encounter with the composer and conductor Leonard Bernstein provides a surprisingly bawdy anecdote from the mannerly Stevens, who often prefaced his questions on the bench with a courtly, "May I just ask . . . ?"

It was during a dinner at the French Embassy in Washington when Stevens and his wife, Maryan, were seated with Bernstein, who had just conducted the Orchestre National de France at the Kennedy Center. Maryan wondered about the emotions that accompany performing a masterpiece.

"It's like [making love] in a cathedral," Bernstein replied, according to Stevens in the memoir. The justice dutifully used the f-word to authenticate his reporting.

"The Making of a Justice" is Stevens's third book since leaving the court; the others chronicle the chief justices with whom he served and how he would remake the Constitution. He said he is unsure if there is a lesson in it for readers. "I didn't have a specific mission in mind, I just started to write," he said.

One lesson from childhood that informed his career, though, involved his father. The Depression hit after the Stevens Hotel opened, and the place faltered. The hotel borrowed money from an insurance company controlled by Stevens's grandfather, an act that a Cook County prosecutor viewed as embezzlement. Ernest Stevens was found guilty, only to have his conviction overturned by the Illinois Supreme Court, which found not a "scintilla" of evidence of criminal intent.

"Firsthand knowledge of the criminal justice's fallibility" made Stevens skeptical for the rest of his career, he said. "The system is not perfect—it's pretty good, but it's not perfect."

Stevens was part of majorities that handed important victories to gays, limited the death penalty and mostly held the line on abortion rights.

On the latter, he said he is puzzled by "more and more state legislatures" passing restrictive laws in hopes of getting the Supreme Court to revisit the court's rulings.

"I thought that was an issue that had been resolved," he said. "I have no idea what the present court will do."

In the book, he detailed his efforts to derail the *Heller* majority. He adopted Justice Antonin Scalia's originalist approach to show, in his opinion, that historical texts supported the view that the Second Amendment was aimed at preventing federal disarmament of state militias, rather than forbidding efforts at gun control.

He wrote that he circulated his dissent five weeks before Scalia's majority opinion, in hopes of persuading Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and—somewhat surprisingly—Justice Clarence Thomas.

"I think he's an intellectually honest person, and I just thought there was a chance he might be persuaded" on the historical argu-

ments, Stevens said of Thomas. "I guess I was kind of dreaming a little bit."

But Stevens said the effort did succeed in getting Kennedy to insist Scalia include limiting language that states and cities have used to defend their gun-control measures.

In the book, Stevens refers to *U.S. v. Nixon*, in which the court said the president must turn over White House tapes to congressional investigators, as "the high point for judicial independence."

He wrote the court's unanimous decision in *Clinton v. Jones*, saying that a sitting president does not have immunity from all civil lawsuits for actions when he was not in office.

Both were unanimous and "easy decisions," Stevens said, but he declined to be drawn into the current battle between congressional investigators and President Trump.

He is asked: Nothing to say about the president? "Nothing that you don't know already," he said.

#### TRIBUTE TO BISHOP THOMAS C. ELY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a wonderful friend, Bishop Thomas C. Ely, who is retiring from his leadership position of the Episcopal Diocese of Vermont.

Bishop Ely has been an outstanding servant of the Vermont diocese since his consecration as bishop in 2001. During his tenure in the Green Mountain State, he has served as the leader of the 45 Episcopal congregations in Vermont and one more across Lake Champlain in Essex, NY. He has visited all parishes once a year and counseled many clergy members. Bishop Ely's devotion to human dignity and dignity education influenced every church in the diocese. He demonstrated this as chairman of the board and as an educator of Rock Point School in Burlington, where his wife Ann worked all through his tenure as bishop. Bishop Ely, as a promoter of social justice and equality, also showed leadership in many other ways. He has been active in immigrants' rights, marriage equality, improving the lives of those living in poverty and in Bishops Against Gun Violence. His work on human rights is illustrated in his long commitment to the human rights organization Cristosal, which works in Central America.

Recently, Bishop Ely completed the successful Partnership Campaign for Rock Point, raising over \$2 million to assure the future of the 130 acres owned by the Church on Lake Champlain in Burlington. The funds will improve the trails and facilities in partnership with the city of Burlington and the Lake Champlain Land Trust, preserving 93 acres for public access.

I am proud to say that Bishop Ely lives his faith, through worship, leadership, and through action to improve and enrich the lives of all Vermonters. His journey of faith and action would not have been possible without the love and support of Ann Ely who, in addition to her work at Rock Point School, has also been deeply involved in St. Paul's Cathedral in Burlington.

The outpouring of gratitude and love for Tom and Ann has been enormous, in particular at the May 18, 2019, convention, where Vermont Episcopalians elected their next bishop. The applause would not cease until Bishop Ely motioned for quiet, so that proceedings could continue. Bishop Ely is loved by his people and greatly appreciated by many Vermonters for his principled leadership. He made a difference, helping us to live up to our ideals, and will be fondly remembered, as he and Ann enter a new phase of their lives. Marcelle and I are delighted that Tom and Ann will continue to be citizens of Vermont, living in the beautiful town of Newfane. We both value their friendship.

In honor of Bishop Ely's retirement, I ask that the December 5, 2017, Episcopal New Service article "Vermont Episcopal Bishop Thomas Ely announces plans to retire," be entered into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Episcopal News Service, Dec. 5, 2017]

**VERMONT EPISCOPAL BISHOP THOMAS ELY  
ANNOUNCES PLAN TO RETIRE**

The Right Reverend Thomas C. Ely, tenth bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Vermont, recently announced his intention to retire and resign his ministry, no later than September 30, 2019. He has agreed to remain in his position until a successor is chosen and is in place.

Ely, 65, was consecrated as bishop of the Vermont diocese in 2001, having previously served as a priest in the Diocese of Connecticut for 20 years. In a message to the people of the Diocese of Vermont, Ely said that by the time of his retirement he will have served in the priesthood for nearly 39 years.

"There are other interests and ministries to which I am feeling called to devote my time and energy while my health and stamina are still good," Ely said, "including family, community theatre, various justice ministries and a bit more golf."

During his episcopate, Ely has been a leader both within the diocese and throughout the wider Episcopal Church on such controversial issues as marriage equality, the ordination of LGBT clergy, increased gun safety and racial justice. He is also a leading voice on matters of environmental and economic justice.

As part of his global outreach, Ely serves on the board of Cristosal, a nongovernmental agency based in El Salvador that works to advance human rights in Central America. Additionally, he is a co-founder of the Vermont chapter of Kids4Peace, a grassroots interfaith youth movement dedicated to ending conflict and inspiring hope in Jerusalem and divided societies around the world. More locally, Ely is a leading advocate for the Vermont Ecumenical Council and Vermont Interfaith Action.

Ely has been instrumental in the stewardship and revitalization of Rock Point, a 130-acre property in Burlington, owned by the Vermont diocese, known for its natural beauty and peaceful atmosphere. Each year, nearly 10,000 people visit Rock Point, and Ely is overseeing a \$1.7 million partnership campaign aimed at improving facilities, strengthening leadership and expanding public access.

Ely said that he and his wife, Ann, will take up residence in their house in Newfane, Vermont, upon his retirement. In the meantime, he says, "I plan to use these months ahead to continue encouraging full and passionate engagement in our local mission approaches, and I plan to continue my efforts related to a sustainable Rock Point and all that means to our life as the Episcopal Church in Vermont."

**RECOGNIZING DARN TOUGH SOCKS**

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Darn Tough Vermont says that their factory in Northfield, Vermont, is the "Sock Capital of the World." I'm loath to object to that claim. Over the past 15 years, Darn Tough has steadily grown from a small sock producer for other companies into a world-renowned brand of their own. They've created good paying jobs to Vermont and have a deep commitment to American manufacturing. Darn Tough is a great example of the many hearty small businesses that drive Vermont's economy. It is with pride that I recognize their achievements.

Marc Cabot opened Darn Tough's factory, Cabot Hosiery Mills, in 1978. He started by producing private label socks—other companies sell these under their brand name—for large companies like Brooks Brothers and Old Navy. This was a steady business. But things became difficult in the 1990s when many of those customers began to move their production overseas. By the early 2000s, Cabot Hosiery Mills was struggling.

Marc's son, Ric, who had been involved in the family business from a young age, came up with an idea to save the company. He decided to transition Cabot Hosiery Mills from a private label producer to its own brand: Darn Tough Vermont. Ric envisioned a superior, outdoor-oriented sock that was knit right in Vermont. Its quality would speak for itself.

At first, Ric had to give Darn Tough socks away to get noticed. He gave out 3,500 pairs of Darn Tough socks at the Vermont City Marathon in 2004, and soon after word, began to spread about a mysteriously durable sock with a lifetime warranty produced right in Vermont. Darn Tough's brand and sales have been growing steadily ever since.

Over the past 15 years, the Cabots have rebounded from the brink of bankruptcy to a company nearing \$50 million in sales annually. Ric, who is now the CEO and president, is leading Darn Tough in its latest expansion. They've added over 50 new knitting stations and are in the process of expanding their workforce of over 250 Vermonters. Darn Tough doubled down on American manufacturing when their partners wouldn't—now they're seeing their reward.

I am proud to recognize the contributions and achievements that Darn Tough and the Cabot family has made over their over 40 years in Vermont. I ask consent to enter into the RECORD a VTDigger article titled "Making it in

Vermont: Darn Tough doubles down on Northfield facilities." It describes the hard work that goes into making each Darn Tough sock and highlights Darn Tough's commitment to Vermont and Vermont values.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From VTDigger, March 31, 2019]

**MAKING IT IN VERMONT: DARN TOUGH  
DOUBLES DOWN ON NORTHFIELD FACILITIES**

Ask Kirk Smith how many colors of yarn are used at Cabot Hosiery Mills, and he'll tell you: "Too many."

The family-owned factory that produces Darn Tough socks will include up to 16 different threads in a single design. The operation spins out 22,000 pairs of socks every single day.

From the outside, the Northfield production facility isn't much to look at—it's big, beige and unmarked. But inside, thousands of spools of multicolored yarn hang from the ceiling, while computerized machines knit the threads into socks.

"If you had seen me when they took me on my tour when I was being interviewed here, I was like a kid in a candy shop," said Smith, the plant's manager of manufacturing operations. "I didn't want to leave the line. I just wanted to keep seeing what was going on."

Lined up in rows with their electronic displays blinking, the mill's 184 knitting stations resemble slot machines at a casino. But they have a more predictable output: roughly every five minutes, each one dispenses a fresh new sock.

Darn Tough is in the midst of an ambitious five-year expansion plan. In order to increase production, they're adding more machines, bringing their total to 236—for now. Ric Cabot, the company's president and CEO, said those machines will increase the mill's production by 1.5 million pairs of socks per year.

"Accommodating the new equipment required moving their packaging and distribution areas to another building about a mile down the road. That means the company's annual "sock sale"—two weekends in November when locals walk the warehouse looking for deals on factory seconds—will take place at the company's satellite location this year.

There are two sock seasons each year, and the factory works about six months ahead of schedule. Right now, they're mainly producing fall socks.

Each piece is knit, washed, dried, boarded, folded, inspected and packaged in Northfield, before being shipped off to the company's distribution center in Cleveland, Ohio.

"The Cabots have always been very dedicated to their Northfield roots," Smith said. "Could there be better places in the state? Maybe, but this is where they started. This is where they have a connection and this is where we'll be."

**BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for May 2019. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, BBA18. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation.

The Republican staff of the Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

This is my fourth scorekeeping report this year. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 10, 2019. The information included in this report is current through May 20, 2019.

Since my last filing, Congress has cleared only one measure, S. 1436, a bill to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110-279, with significant budgetary effects. This bill made changes to the calculation of retirement benefits for certain employees who staff the dining services for the U.S. Senate. Those services were privatized in 2008.

Budget Committee Republican staff prepared tables A–C.

Table A gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the fiscal year 2019 enforceable levels filing required by BBA18. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. Over the current 10-year enforceable window, authorizing committees have increased outlays by a combined \$3.4 billion. For this reporting period, 9 of the 16 authorizing committees are not in compliance with their allocations. As a result of passage of S. 1436, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is now in violation of its allocation for both budget authority and outlays over the fiscal year 2019–2028 period.

Table B provides the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. Appropriations for fiscal year 2019, displayed in this table, show that the Appropriations Committee is compliant with spending limits for the current fiscal year. Those limits for regular discretionary spending are \$647 billion for accounts in the defense category and \$597 billion for accounts in the nondefense category of spending.

The fiscal year 2018 budget resolution contained points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPs. Table C, which tracks the CHIMP limit of \$15 billion for fiscal year 2019, shows the Appropriations Committee has enacted \$15 billion worth of full-year CHIMPs for this fiscal year.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

For fiscal year 2019, CBO estimates that current-law levels are \$2.9 billion above and \$3.3 billion below enforceable levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively. Revenues are \$426

million below the level assumed in the budget resolution. Further, Social Security revenues are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2019, while Social Security outlays are \$4 million above assumed levels for the budget year.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The PAYGO scorecard shows deficit increases in fiscal year 2019 of \$1,957 million, \$427 million revenue loss, \$1,530 million outlay increase; over the fiscal year 2018–2023 period of \$3,373 million, \$894 million revenue loss, \$2,479 million outlay increase; and over the fiscal year 2018–2028 period of \$443 million, \$634 million revenue loss, \$191 million outlay decrease.

This submission also includes a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the enforcement filing on May 7, 2018. Since my last report, no new budgetary points of order were raised.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**TABLE A.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS**

(In millions of dollars)				
	2019	2019–2023	2019–2028	
<b>Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry</b>				
Budget Authority .....	2,414	4,249	3,123	
Outlays .....	1,401	1,797	70	
<b>Armed Services</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	0	0	
Outlays .....	0	0	0	
<b>Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs</b>				
Budget Authority .....	21	285	382	
Outlays .....	20	285	382	
<b>Commerce, Science, and Transportation</b>				
Budget Authority .....	41	77	91	
Outlays .....	11	74	90	
<b>Energy and Natural Resources</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	–10	–24	
Outlays .....	0	–10	–24	
<b>Environment and Public Works</b>				
Budget Authority .....	2	4	–333	
Outlays .....	2	4	–333	
<b>Finance</b>				
Budget Authority .....	378	1,128	–889	
Outlays .....	159	1,120	–892	
<b>Foreign Relations</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	–5	–20	
Outlays .....	0	–5	–20	
<b>Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	2	4	
Outlays .....	43	48	49	
<b>Judiciary</b>				
Budget Authority .....	13	209	497	
Outlays .....	13	205	492	
<b>Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	–36	–84	
Outlays .....	0	–36	–84	
<b>Rules and Administration</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	0	1	
Outlays .....	0	0	1	
<b>Intelligence</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	0	0	
Outlays .....	0	0	0	
<b>Veterans' Affairs</b>				
Budget Authority .....	4	3	–729	
Outlays .....	4,402	4,400	3,668	
<b>Indian Affairs</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	0	0	
Outlays .....	0	0	0	
<b>Small Business</b>				
Budget Authority .....	0	0	0	
Outlays .....	0	0	0	
<b>Total</b>				
Budget Authority .....	2,873	5,906	2,019	
Outlays .....	6,051	7,882	3,399	

**TABLE B.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS <sup>1</sup>**

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2019	
	Security <sup>2</sup>	Nonsecurity <sup>2</sup>
Statutory Discretionary Limits .....	647,000	597,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies .....	0	23,042
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies .....	5,499	58,619
Defense .....	606,340	129
Energy and Water Development .....	22,440	22,200
Financial Services and General Government .....	31	23,392
Homeland Security .....	2,058	47,353
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies .....	0	35,552
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies .....	0	178,076
Legislative Branch .....	0	4,836
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies .....	10,332	86,804
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs .....	0	46,218
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies .....	300	70,779
Current Level Total .....	647,000	597,000
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits .....	0	0

<sup>1</sup> This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

<sup>2</sup> Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

**TABLE C.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)**

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

2019	
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2019 .....	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies .....	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies .....	7,285
Defense .....	0
Energy and Water Development .....	0
Financial Services and General Government .....	0
Homeland Security .....	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies .....	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies .....	7,715
Legislative Branch .....	0
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies .....	0
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs .....	0
Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies .....	0
Current Level Total .....	15,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution .....	0

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, May 22, 2019.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through May 20, 2019. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018, pursuant to section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123).

Since our last letter dated April 10, 2019, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues in fiscal year 2019.

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY  
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF MAY 20, 2019

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority .....	3,639.3	3,642.2	2.9
Outlays .....	3,550.0	3,546.7	–3.3
Revenues .....	2,590.5	2,590.1	–0.4

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF MAY 20, 2019—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays <sup>a</sup> .....	908.8	908.8	0.0
Social Security Revenues .....	899.2	899.2	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

<sup>a</sup>Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF MAY 20, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: <sup>a,b,c</sup>			
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	2,271,360	2,169,258	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation .....	1,886,507	1,949,120	–302
Offsetting receipts .....	–890,012	–890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted .....	3,267,855	3,228,363	2,590,194
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation			
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–3) .....	120	8	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6, Division H) <sup>d</sup> .....	2	2	1
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (P.L. 116–8) .....	0	–5	0
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–16) .....	52	32	0
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation .....	174	37	1
Appropriation Legislation: <sup>b</sup>			
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6) <sup>b,c</sup> .....	480,297	311,586	–125
Total, Enacted Legislation .....	480,471	311,623	–124
Entitlements and Mandatories .....	–106,128	6,756	0
Total Current Level <sup>c</sup> .....	3,642,198	3,546,742	2,590,070
Total Senate Resolution <sup>c</sup> .....	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496
Current Level Over Senate Resolution .....	2,874	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution .....	n.a.	3,267	426
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2019–2028:			
Senate Current Level .....	n.a.	n.a.	33,272,518
Senate Resolution <sup>c</sup> .....	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,213
Current Level Over Senate Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	695

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

<sup>a</sup> Includes the budgetary effects of legislation enacted by Congress during the 115th Congress.

<sup>b</sup> Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$771 million in budget authority, and \$767 million in estimated outlays.

<sup>c</sup> For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include those items.

<sup>d</sup> The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–5), as amended, extended several immigration programs through February 15, 2019, that would otherwise have expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. The estimated budgetary effects of those previously enacted extensions are charged to the Committee on Appropriations, and are included in the budgetary effects of P.L. 116–6 shown in the “Appropriation Legislation” portion of this report. In addition, division H of P.L. 116–6 further extended those same programs through the end of fiscal year 2019. Consistent with the language in title III of division H of P.L. 116–6, and at the direction of the Senate Committee on the Budget, the budgetary effects of extending those immigration programs for the remainder of the fiscal year are charged to the relevant authorizing committees, and are shown in the “Authorizing Legislation” portion of this report.

<sup>e</sup> Section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 requires the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2019; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 also allows the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget to revise the budgetary aggregates:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 7, 2018: .....	3,547,094	3,508,052	2,590,496
Revisions:			
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 .....	921	0	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 .....	69,464	38,556	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 .....	0	–214	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 .....	1,680	25	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 .....	20,165	3,590	0
Revised Senate Resolution .....	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF MAY 20, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Beginning Balance <sup>a</sup> .....	0	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: <sup>b,c</sup>				
A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Incident Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act” (S.J. Res. 57, P.L. 115–172) .....	*	*	*	*
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (S. 2155, P.L. 115–174) <sup>d</sup> .....	*	22	329	490
Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017 (S. 204, P.L. 115–176) .....	*	*	*	*
An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes (H.R. 3562, P.L. 115–177) .....	*	*	*	*
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (S. 2372, P.L. 115–182) <sup>c</sup> .....	*	*	*	*
Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act (S. 1869, P.L. 115–192) .....	*	*	*	*
All Circuit Review Act (H.R. 2229, P.L. 115–195) .....	*	*	*	*
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770, P.L. 115–197) .....	0	3	3	0
Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018 (H.R. 4743, P.L. 115–189) .....	*	*	*	*
Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 (H.R. 5956, P.L. 115–218) .....	0	0	0	–3
KIWI Act (S. 2245, P.L. 115–226) .....	*	*	*	*
To make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes (H.R. 4528, P.L. 115–228) .....	*	*	*	*
John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (H.R. 5515, P.L. 115–232) .....	*	*	*	*
Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Act of 2018 (H.R. 4318, P.L. 115–239) .....	0	304	690	–118
Tribal Social Security Fairness Act of 2018 (H.R. 6124, P.L. 115–243) .....	0	*	–1	–3
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.R. 6157, Division B, P.L. 115–245, Division B) .....	0	0	18	18
Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017 (S. 97, P.L. 115–248) .....	*	*	*	*
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2018 (S. 3479, P.L. 115–251) .....	*	2	*	–3



TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF MAY 20, 2019—Continued  
(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2019	2018– 2023	2018– 2028
Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act of 2017 (H.R. 698, P.L. 115–252) .....	*	*	*	*
FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (H.R. 302, P.L. 115–254) <sup>a</sup> .....	*	44	42	26
Patient Right To Know Drug Act of 2018 (S. 2554, P.L. 115–263) .....	*	*	–11	–52
Orrin G. Hatch–Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act (H.R. 1551, P.L. 115–264) .....	0	0	13	–24
Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 3509, P.L. 115–268) .....	0	*	2	4
America’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (S. 3021, P.L. 115–270) .....	0	2	16	–230
SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (H.R. 6, P.L. 115–271) <sup>a</sup> .....	0	*	*	*
Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017 (S. 1595, P.L. 115–272) .....	0	*	*	*
To authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (H.R. 1037, P.L. 115–275) .....	0	*	*	*
Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act (H.R. 2615, P.L. 115–279) .....	0	*	*	*
Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (S. 140, P.L. 115–282) .....	0	10	34	0
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes (H.J. Res. 143, P.L. 115–298) .....	0	*	*	*
Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018 (S. 2152, P.L. 115–299) .....	0	*	*	*
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota (S. 440, P.L. 115–306) .....	0	0	0	–4
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes (S. 2074, P.L. 115–308) .....	0	0	0	–7
Anwar Sadat Centennial Celebration Act (H.R. 754, P.L. 115–310) .....	0	*	*	*
Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act (H.R. 1861, P.L. 115–322) .....	0	*	*	*
Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (H.R. 1872, P.L. 115–330) .....	0	*	*	*
Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act (H.R. 3996, P.L. 115–332) .....	0	*	*	*
Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (H.R. 2, P.L. 115–334) .....	0	1,399	1,785	0
Nicaragua Human Rights and Anticorruption Act of 2018 (H.R. 1918, P.L. 115–335) .....	0	*	*	*
21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act (H.R. 5759, P.L. 115–336) .....	0	*	*	*
Chinese–American World War II Veteran Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 1050, P.L. 115–337) .....	0	*	*	*
USS Indianapolis Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2101, P.L. 115–338) .....	0	*	*	*
Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act (H.R. 1235, P.L. 115–343) .....	0	0	0	0
Sanctioning the Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act (H.R. 3342, P.L. 115–348) .....	0	*	*	*
Correcting Miscalculations in Veterans’ Pensions Act (H.R. 4431, P.L. 115–352) .....	0	*	*	*
Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (H.R. 5787, P.L. 115–358) .....	0	*	*	*
Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act (H.R. 5923, P.L. 115–361) .....	0	*	*	*
To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend through 2023 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission (H.R. 7120, P.L. 115–386) .....	0	*	*	*
First Step Act of 2018 (S. 756, P.L. 115–391) .....	0	11	120	317
Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (S. 1311, P.L. 115–392) .....	0	*	*	*
CENOTE Act of 2018 (S. 2511, P.L. 115–394) .....	0	*	*	*
NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act of 2018 (S. 7, P.L. 115–403) .....	0	0	5	5
Veterans Benefits and Transition Act of 2018 (S. 2248, P.L. 115–407) .....	0	*	*	*
Stephen Michael Gleason Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2652, P.L. 115–415) .....	0	*	*	*
Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act of 2018 (S. 2679, P.L. 115–416) .....	0	*	*	*
Forever GI Bill Housing Payment Fulfillment Act of 2018 (S. 3777, P.L. 115–422) .....	0	*	*	*
National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 2200, P.L. 115–423) .....	0	*	*	*
To authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (H.R. 4689, P.L. 115–429) .....	0	*	*	*
75th Anniversary of World War II Commemoration Act (S. 3661, P.L. 115–433) .....	0	*	*	*
Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act (H.R. 251, P.L. 116–2) .....	0	*	*	*
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (H.R. 259, P.L. 116–3) .....	0	8	63	*
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 28, P.L. 116–5) .....	0	*	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 31, P.L. 116–6) <sup>b</sup> .....	0	125	229	9
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (S. 483, P.L. 116–8) .....	0	–5	–23	0
John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (S. 47, P.L. 116–9) .....	0	0	–10	–10
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (H.R. 1839, P.L. 116–16) .....	0	32	69	27
Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act (H.R. 1222, P.L. 116–17) .....	0	*	*	*
An act to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110–279 (S. 1436) .....	0	*	*	1
Impact on Deficit .....	*	1,957	3,373	443
Total Change in Outlays .....	*	1,530	2,479	–191
Total Change in Revenues .....	*	–427	–894	–634

Source: Congressional Budget Office.  
Notes: P.L. = Public Law, \* = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.  
<sup>a</sup> On May 7, 2018, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate’s Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.  
<sup>b</sup> The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.  
<sup>c</sup> Excludes off-budget amounts.  
<sup>d</sup> Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve’s surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.  
<sup>e</sup> The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 512 of the Act.  
<sup>f</sup> Division I of P.L. 115–254 contains the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2018, which provided \$1.680 million in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. At the direction of the Committees on the Budget, and consistent with the language in section 1701, those amounts are shown as discretionary spending.  
<sup>g</sup> The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 8231 of the Act.  
<sup>h</sup> The budgetary effects of title I of division H are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to title III of division H of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2019 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive	Result
127	June 18, 2018 .....	H.R. 5515—John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.	4106(a)–Senate-Pay-As-You-Go Violation <sup>1</sup> .....	Sen. McConnell (R–KY) <sup>2</sup> .....	81–14, waived
192	August 23, 2018 .....	S. Amdt. #3695 to H.R. 6157, the Defense, Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Act <sup>3</sup> .	314(a) CHIMP with Net-Costs .....	Sen. Leahy (D–VT) .....	68–24, waived

<sup>1</sup> Senator Sanders raised a section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress) point of order against the bill because the bill would increase the on-budget deficit.  
<sup>2</sup> By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to a roll call vote to waive the point of order.  
<sup>3</sup> This surgical point of order would have struck lines 7–8 of page 270 in Division B (Title III) of the substitute amendment, which was related to the Pell Grant program. This provision was a Change in Mandatory Program (CHIMP) estimated to increase spending by \$390 million over 10 years.

SRI LANKA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this week marks the 10th anniversary of the end of Sri Lanka’s decades-long civil war. On May 19, 2009, Sri Lanka’s 26-year conflict between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, LTTE, and the government of Sri Lanka came to a close with the LTTE’s military defeat and surrender. This anniversary comes on the heels of the horrible Easter Sunday terrorist attacks on churches across Sri Lanka for which we are still seeking answers and accountability from ISIS and its affiliates on the island.

While the end of the war was a counterterrorism victory, we have since learned the ugly cost of this effort. According to International Crisis Group, in the final months of Sri Lanka’s civil war, Sri Lankan Government “attacks on its own self-declared ‘no-fire zones’ killed tens of thousands of [Tamil] civilians . . . claims range from 7,000 to 147,000 dead.” For several years, I have been calling for an international, independent mechanism to investigate allegations of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed during the Sri Lankan conflict.

I also remain concerned about recent violations of human rights and religious freedom in that country.

Since the end of the war, there has yet to be real progress made on reconciliation and accountability for Tamils through domestic processes, as recommended by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights 2015 Investigation on Sri Lanka, OISL. Human rights violations against Tamil, Christian, and Muslim minorities continue, and the Sri Lankan Government has

failed to bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against journalists, religious, and ethnic minorities and opposition politicians.

Sri Lanka has a long way to go on its path to reconciliation. In addition to pursuing meaningful justice and accountability, the Sri Lankan Government must implement comprehensive security sector reform, fully operationalize the Office of Missing Persons to provide families with answers on what happened to their loved ones, repeal the controversial Prevention of Terrorism Act, PTA, release political prisoners as called for by our own State Department and required by fiscal year 2019 Appropriations bill and address the root causes of the civil war and the government's responsibility to protect citizens of all communities.

Concerns over intercommunal strife are exacerbated by the horrific April 21 Easter attacks on churches and hotels across the island that killed over 200 civilians. We are learning that ISIS-affiliated entities were behind the attacks. As Sri Lanka deals with the very new threat of Islamic extremism, it is critical that its government not repeat its pattern of suppressing media, civil society, and religious freedom under the veil of counterterrorism. The government's abuse of emergency powers, recent ban on Muslim face-covers, coupled with retaliatory attacks against mosques and Muslim businesses with little response from Sri Lanka law enforcement is problematic and only serves to heighten tensions between religious and ethnic communities. I urge the Sri Lankan security forces to exercise restraint in their response to the Easter attacks.

While horrific on their own, the Easter attacks were a stark reminder that, as we come upon the 10th anniversary of the end of Sri Lanka's civil war, intercommunal conflict remains a reality on the island. The Sri Lankan Government's response to the Easter attacks echoes of the country's history of conflict and oppression under cover of counterterrorism. As we remember and commemorate the tens of thousands of lives lost leading up to May 2009, I urge Sri Lanka, the United States and the international community to continue to pursue justice, accountability, and reconciliation for a war-torn nation.

#### REMEMBERING ELLEN TAUSCHER

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the wonderful spirit and dedication of Ellen Tauscher, who was taken from us far too early on April 29, 2019. She was a one of a kind of person and very special to me.

Ellen is survived by her daughter Katherine, who is an amazing young woman. I have seen her through some of the most difficult days and she has an equanimity and an ability second to none. Ellen's sisters Sally and Kathy and brother Jack provided very strong

family support to her, especially at the end. She is truly loved.

Ellen touched so many lives, and anybody who has worked with her, had dinner with her, drank a little California wine with her knows the special person she is.

Ellen was one of the first women and the youngest woman ever at the age of 25 to become a member of the New York Stock Exchange in 1977.

I was president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors at that time, and I can tell you, being a woman on the Stock Exchange at that time was a very big deal.

Ellen was to go on to work in finance for 14 years as a successful investment banker and bond trader.

A few years after she moved west, Ellen gave birth to her pride and joy, the wonderful Katherine Tauscher. As a new mother herself, Ellen struggled to find good childcare, and she used that experience to create the ChildCare Registry, a service to help parents check backgrounds of childcare centers.

You see, that was how she was. When she saw a problem, she worked out a solution. When Ellen Tauscher put her mind to something, there was no stopping her. Achievement was a given.

Ellen ran for a seat in Congress in 1996. The newly created district was conservative, and few people thought it would go to a Democrat, but Ellen appealed to moderates on both sides of the aisle, and success, I always thought, was a given. She went on to win that seat and hold it for 12 years.

As a Member of Congress, Ellen made a name for herself as a centrist, someone who could work both sides of the aisle. Her colleagues, many of whom attended the memorial service earlier this week at the National Cathedral, knew she would always do what was best for her district and for the country.

Ellen sat on the House Armed Services Committee and became chair of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. Not necessarily what you would expect from an elementary education major from New Jersey, but Ellen was a real force.

She developed an expertise and substantial knowledge in arms control, nonproliferation, and nuclear weapons. It was a good fit since her district was home to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

That expertise and the ability to be effective in a critically important post was a big reason why then-Secretary of State Clinton selected her and President Obama nominated her to be Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

One of Ellen's biggest accomplishments in that role was shepherding the negotiations over the New START Treaty and helping with its ratification through the Senate in 2010.

As a matter of fact, it was at her suggestion that former Senator Jon Kyl and I went to Geneva under the aus-

pices of the Senate National Security Working Group to observe the negotiations and meet with the Russian and U.S. delegations. Ellen was so proud of the treaty, and so are we.

She proved just how strong she was during this most difficult period. She did much of her work on the treaty while suffering from esophageal cancer, but she never let it slow her down. When she retired from the Federal Government, a new world would open.

She was appointed by Governor Jerry Brown to the University of California Board of Regents, she chaired California's Military Advisory Council, and she served as vice chair of the Atlantic Council's Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security.

Just last year, she showed she was still a player in California politics, working with Katie Merrill to create a Political Action Committee called Fight Back, and that was just what Ellen did.

Ellen was brilliant. She was warm and loyal to her country, her family, and her friends, and she had a wonderful sense of humor. I saw this constantly over a glass of wine and dinner in Washington. She was always ready with something that made friends smile and even laugh.

She was, for me, a best friend, and that will never change. Thank you.

#### TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE E. HENNING

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor an American hero who served bravely in the European Campaign of the Second World War.

Lawrence E. Henning of Great Falls, MT, served in the Third Army under the command of General George S. Patton. He marched with thousands of Allied troops across the Continent, through France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and finally into Germany, deploying his expertise of the tank destroyer in the final, decisive year of the war.

Lawrence's courage and ingenuity were critical to the effort. His resourcefulness allowed the battalion to maintain a maximum number of tank destroyers on the front line. His skills and bravery on the battlefield earned him commendations decades ago; it is my honor to finally deliver them today.

I am proud to present you, Lawrence, with the Bronze Star Medal for your Meritorious Service in connection with military operations against an enemy of the United States in France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Germany during the period 15 September 1944 to 30 March 1945.

I am also presenting you with: the American Defense Service Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with 3 Bronze Service Stars; the World War II Victory Medal; and the Honorable Service Lapel Button—World War II.

These medals are a small token of our nation's appreciation for your service and your sacrifice.

Lawrence, you are an American hero, and Montana is proud to call you one of our own.

#### NATIONAL SEERSUCKER DAY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I rise in recognition of seersucker manufacturers and enthusiasts across the United States. I wish everyone a Happy National Seersucker Day. This uniquely American fashion has a storied history dating back to 1909. Louisiana is proud to have played an important part in introducing the country to seersucker apparel. The first seersucker suit was designed by Joseph Haspel at his Broad Street facility in New Orleans, LA.

This lightweight cotton fabric, known for its signature pucker, has been worn and enjoyed by Americans across the country during the hot summer months. Mr. Haspel said it best, "Hot is hot, no matter what you do for a living." In the 1990s, Seersucker Day was established by Members of this Chamber to honor this unique American fashion. I proudly resumed this tradition in 2014 in the U.S. House of Representatives by designating Wednesday, June 11, as National Seersucker Day. I have continued this tradition in the U.S. Senate and wish to designate Thursday, June 13, as the sixth annual National Seersucker Day. I encourage everyone to wear seersucker on this day to commemorate this iconic American clothing.

#### TRIBUTE TO UTAH'S SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTEES

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is that time of year where I am privileged to recognize exceptional young men and women from the great State of Utah who have answered the call to serve by applying to the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the U.S. Military Academy, and the U.S. Naval Academy. It is one of my greatest honors to recognize these fine Utahns in the U.S. Senate.

Under title 10 of the U.S. Code, each year, Members of Congress are authorized to nominate a number of young men and women from their district or State to attend the country's service academies. Each of these students is of sound mind and body. This will serve them well in Colorado Springs, Kings Point, West Point, and Annapolis, but to succeed, they will need more than this.

The journey on which these young men and women will soon embark requires more than mental and physical aptitude. It also demands strong moral character: leadership, courage, honesty, prudence, and self-discipline. It calls for a commitment to service and a love of country. Ultimately, it provides a chance for some of Utah's finest to stand up for our country.

Today, I would like to congratulate each of these impressive students, all of whom embody, in their own unique

way, the standards of excellence upon which America's service academies are built.

Carson James Angerth will be attending the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy after graduating from Cottonwood High School, where he was part of the State champion baseball team. He served as a church camp counselor for 3 years and served his neighbors by helping them clean and renovate their homes. As a leader in the youth organization through his church, he is as an example for his peers. He is often found outdoors hiking, biking, and skiing.

Jackson Thomas DuPaix accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. He earned his diploma a year early from Rockbridge County High School and has been attending Southern Virginia University. An Eagle Scout from Riverton, UT, he was part of his high school's drone club and lacrosse team. He served as president of his church youth group and stayed active in his community by helping with home renovations, city landscaping projects, and putting together Christmas boxes of food and toys.

Cassidy Ann Eiting is following in her father's footsteps and attending the U.S. Air Force Academy. After graduating from South Summit High School, she attended the Northwestern Preparatory School. She was a leader in high school as the student body vice president, captain of both her swimming and soccer teams, and a member of the two-time State champion softball team. Inspired by her mother, a commissioned Air Force officer, she stayed active in her school and community as a member of the MiteE Team, Interact Club, and National Honor Society.

Jacob Joseph Frederick, the student body president of Skyline High School, will follow his father to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He attended Boys State and earned his Eagle Scout Award, while being active on the basketball and lacrosse teams. Building his leadership skills, Jacob served as first chair trumpet for the concert band and jazz band, coach of a youth basketball team, and as a summer camp counselor. He worked on projects benefiting veterans at the Fisher House in Salt Lake City.

Christina Gillespie accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, joining a long family tradition of Air Force service. She graduated from Clearfield High School where she maintained a 4.0 GPA and captained the swimming team, earning the MVP title twice. She served as president of her church youth group and as the student body officer over service, where her school raised \$50,000 for local charities. A member of the school choir, Christina is also a member of the Oratorio Society of Utah, a nondenominational choral organization.

Enoch Austin Horning, a member of the Utah Army National Guard, will be continuing his service at the U.S. Military

Academy at West Point after having attended the Military Academy's preparatory school. He served as the student body president of the Utah Military Academy, where he was captain of the Ranger Team. Enoch was awarded the JROTC Cadet of the Year Award, earned his Eagle Scout Award, and attended Boys State. He served in the Civil Air Patrol, as president of the Strategic Gaming Club, and as a member of the Cyber Patriots.

Camryn Lynlee Karras, from Weber High School, accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. An outstanding soccer player, Camryn captained both her high school team and her national league club team. She is a member of the National Honor Society, the Robotics Club, and Health Occupations Students of America—HOSA. Each year at Christmastime, she looks forward to providing gifts and breakfast to the Boys and Girls Club in her community.

Spencer Burnett Knudsen will be joining a family history of Army service when he attends the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He is already building his leadership credentials as the student body president of Monticello High School, captain of the basketball team, and head lifeguard for the city of Monticello. Spencer is a member of the National Honor Society, the Future Business Leaders of America—FBLA—and serves his community as a volunteer EMT with San Juan County.

Karsten Korb Matosich will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after graduating from Bingham High School. An Eagle Scout, Karsten serves his community as an organist for his church and at local retirement homes, winterizing homes on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and coordinating the assembly and donation of hundreds of oral hygiene kits. He served as cocaptain of his debate team and played in the Bingham Symphony.

Levi Daniel Montoya will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. As a graduate of Juan Diego Catholic High School, Levi stayed busy as the team captain of both his high school and club lacrosse teams. A member of the National Honor Society, he also was a member of the Key Club, Pre-med Club, and the Boy Scouts. Levi was inspired to attend West Point by his father and grandfather, both Army soldiers, who told the stories of his great-grandfather, Army Medic Albert Montoya, who served valiantly on the beaches of Normandy on June 6, 1944.

Samuel Austin Nafus, who was offered multiple academy appointments, has chosen to follow his brother to the U.S. Naval Academy. A member of the State champion academic olympiad team for Bountiful High School, Sam also participated in DECA, debate, and Model UN. He maintained a 4.0 GPA while being active in his community as a lector for Saint Olaf Catholic Church,

attending Boys State, and earning his Eagle Scout Award. Sam received varsity letters for both football and track.

Jaxon Jefferson Porter will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after having served for 2 years as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Armenia. Jaxon graduated from Weber High School in 2016, where he challenged himself by taking a difficult course load of AP classes. He served his community through projects with the Boy Scouts and with the Bates Elementary School library. Jaxon has been recognized as being goal oriented, which will serve him well as he enters the academy.

Alma Helaman Redd comes from a military family. His father and all of his brothers have served in the military, including an Air Force Academy graduate and a graduate of West Point. Alma is following their examples and attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He graduated from the American Heritage School and is currently attending Utah Valley University after service as missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He is an Eagle Scout and a fan of ultimate frisbee. He attended Boys State and was a member of the yearbook staff, National Honor Society, and the honors band and honors choir.

Gabriel Rosa, a graduate of Skyline High School, has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. A leader in the making, Gabriel served as a captain and squadron commander in the Civil Air Patrol and as the chairman of the Utah Wing Cadet Advisory Council. He captained his ice hockey team, served as president of the Future Business Leaders of America—FBLA—and as the State party chairman at Boys State. Gabriel is a nationally qualified fencer in men's saber.

Ethan James Schofield will be entering the U.S. Air Force Academy after having served as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Indonesia. A graduate of Lone Peak High School, Ethan stayed active in sports and served as the captain of the football team and as a member of the lacrosse and track and field teams. He earned his Eagle Scout Award with a project for the city of American Fork, where his team ran a tree inventory. He is an avid mountain biker and downhill skier.

Matthew Walker Schvaneveldt will again join the cadets of the U.S. Military Academy after having served in the Japan Sapporo Mission with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Matthew graduated from the Northern Utah Academy for Math, Engineering & Science, NUAMES, where he was president of the National Honor Society. He earned his Eagle Scout Award, attended Boys State, and was honored with the Volunteer of the Year Award from McKay-Dee Hospital in Ogden, UT.

Trevor Dean Smiley is returning to the U.S. Air Force Academy following 2

years of missionary service for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Australia Brisbane Mission. Trevor played varsity baseball and football for Corner Canyon High School. He earned his Eagle Scout Award and spent time in Taiwan with the TIYEA leadership camp where he taught English to children.

David Sperry White is returning to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after serving 2 years speaking Korean as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Korea Seoul Mission. A proud graduate and former student body president of Uintah High School in Vernal, UT, David is an Eagle Scout and published author. He attended Boys State and was president of the service club, Vernal Youth in Action.

Michael Ammon Wintercorn has been attending Brigham Young University while preparing himself to attend the U.S. Naval Academy. He graduated from Jordan High School, where he ran for both the cross-country and track and field teams. Michael, an Eagle Scout, served on the Sandy Youth City Council and as president of his church youth group. He spent 2 years speaking Japanese as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Fukuoka Japan Mission. A member of the National Honor Society, Michael also played trumpet for the symphonic band and for a local elderly care center.

Miles Stanley Zembruski is following in the footsteps of the many NASA astronauts he has long admired and accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. A graduate of West High School, where he participated in the Navy JROTC and the Civil Air Patrol, Miles was a member of the Model Rocketry Club, the National Honor Society, and the cross-country team. He founded an independent philosophy/literature publication and a volunteer community service organization, all while maintaining a rigorous academic schedule of AP and IB classes.

It has been inspiring to nominate each of these exemplary young men and women. Doing so has given me an unshakeable confidence in the future of this great Nation and future of our Armed Services.

To these 20 students and to all their future classmates from around the country, do not forget: This is but the beginning of your journey.

You would not have arrived at this point were it not for your hard work and sacrifice and for the service and example your parents, family, teachers, coaches, and mentors. What matters most now is not your past accomplishments, but what you will achieve in the future.

Thank you.

#### TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL SAMUEL A. GREAVES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Sam-

uel A. Greaves, Director of the Missile Defense Agency, on the advent of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force after 37 years of military service to this great country.

General Greaves' long and storied career began when he was commissioned in 1982 through the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps Program after he graduated from Cornell University. Throughout his service, he has held a variety of assignments in operational, acquisition, and staff units, including assignments at Headquarters Air Combat Command; the National Reconnaissance Office; and on the Air Staff. He commanded the 45th Launch Group at Patrick AFB, Florida, the Launch and Range Systems Wing, the Military Satellite Communications Systems Wing, also served as vice commander, Space and Missile Systems Center at Los Angeles AFB. He later served as the director, strategic plans, programs and analyses, Headquarters Air Force Space Command, Peterson AFB, Colorado, and then was assigned as the deputy director, Missile Defense Agency, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama. Prior to his current assignment, he was the commander, Space and Missile Systems Center, Air Force Space Command, Los Angeles Air Force Base, California.

His operational experience is exceptional and includes work on the space shuttle, Titan, Atlas and Delta space-launch systems. He currently wears the Command Space Badge, a joint Air Force and Army award for training, experience, and assignments in space warning, satellite command and control, missile operations, space surveillance, and/or space lift.

During his tour, the Agency and the Department of Defense made significant progress in addressing current and emerging ballistic missile threats by fielding, upgrading, and improving missile defenses to provide U.S. military commanders a highly effective ballistic missile defense capability to defend the United States and its deployed troops, U.S. allies, and friends around the world. He also laid the groundwork for the Agency's pursuit of technologies and systems to track and defeat hypersonic glide vehicle threats. General Greaves implemented a clear strategy focusing on maintaining the reliability of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, BMDS, to build warfighter confidence, increasing capability and capacity of fielded missile defense systems, and making measured investments to address the advanced threat.

While serving as the director, Missile Defense Agency, General Greaves demonstrated superior leadership, extraordinary dedication, and exceptional professionalism as the key interface between MDA and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Staff, Combatant Commands, Services and Military Departments, the Department of State, and international partners. He also

worked very closely with the administration and Congress to support significant improvements to the Nation's missile defense programs and plans in 2017, known as the missile defeat and defense enhancements, that resulted in Congress increasing the Missile Defense Agency's budget request for fiscal year 2018 from \$7.8 billion to over \$11.5 billion, which represents both the largest single year increase and total budget in MDA's history.

General Greaves placed a high priority on increasing the ground-based midcourse defense's, GMD, fleet reliability and confidence by upgrading fielded GBIs, implementing improvements in new production GBIs, and incorporating reliability, producibility and sustainability improvements in future GBI designs. General Greaves oversaw GMD ground system modernization, to include delivery of Ground System 7A, which removed obsolete equipment from the kill chain, eliminated cyber defense vulnerabilities, and improved redundancy for the warfighter. He also pressed forward with key reliability improvements, including the development of the redesigned kill vehicle, RKV, and upgrading of the GMD Communications Network, and launch support equipment.

General Greaves also successfully completed the expansion of the Nation's deployed GBI fleet to 44 interceptors in 2017, known as 44 by 17, which resulted in a nearly 50 percent increase in the number of deployed interceptors available for use by the warfighter.

Moreover, in response to the growing North Korean ICBM threat, in December 2017, General Greaves began executing Department and congressional guidance in the missile defeat and defense enhancements plan to further expand the GBI fleet to a total of 64 deployed GBIs by 2023 through the rapid and efficient construction of a new, fourth missile field at Fort Greely, AK, which will add 20 additional operational silos to the GMD system.

If this were not enough, he oversaw multiple successful flight tests. This includes flight test ground-based midcourse test 11, FTG-11, a GBI salvo test against a complex, threat representative ICBM-class target. This intercept flight test was so successful that the director for the Department Operational Test and Evaluation, DOT&E, Agency directed DOT&E staff to refer to FTG-11 as the first operational flight test of the ground-based midcourse defense system. FTM-45, also conducted under his direction, demonstrated an Aegis BMD organic engagement using a SM-3 Blk IIA against a MRBM, a key milestone for the SM-3 Block IIA return to flight. In addition, he directed the flight test integrated 3, FTI-03, an operational live fire test demonstrating the engage-on-remote capability of the Aegis Weapon System to track and intercept an IRBM target with an Aegis Ashore-launched SM-3 Block IIA interceptor.

This test demonstrated the effectiveness of the European phased adaptive approach phase 3 architecture and supports a critical acquisition milestone for the SM-3 Block IIA missile program.

General Greaves also laid the foundation for the Long Range Discrimination Radar, Homeland Defense Radar-Hawaii, Pacific Radar, and other discrimination improvements to improve homeland defense against emerging threats. He further advanced the development of two-stage booster capability to provide additional homeland defense battle-space capability by enabling shorter engagement times without the expense of a separate development program. He also continued improvements in the command and control, battle management and communication infrastructure, which provides persistent acquisition, tracking, cueing, discrimination, and fire-control quality data to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD), GMD, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, THAAD, Patriot, and coalition partners to support homeland and regional missile defense.

General Greaves was further responsible for major BMDS capability enhancements and asset deployments around the globe. He guided program plans to strengthen regional defenses by continuing deliveries of Standard Missile-3, SM-3, Block IBS, for use on Aegis BMD ships and at Aegis Ashore-Romania, and THAAD interceptors. After fielding the THAAD Battery to South Korea, in late 2017, the commander of United States Forces Korea requested tighter coupling between THAAD and Patriot units in theater. General Greaves worked with Army PEO Missiles and Space on proposed solutions to address the request and improve regional ballistic missile defense. He also pushed for the development of a future THAAD system, including development of a remote launcher capability, integration of Patriot MSE interceptor and launcher into the THAAD Weapon System, and improved interoperability by enabling Patriot Launch-on-Remote (THAAD).

He also continued advancement of the Aegis BMD system in collaboration with the Navy to counter growing and more complex threats, including improvements in system and missile reliability as well as increases in Aegis BMD engagement capacity and lethality, including work on the Aegis Weapon System, Aegis Ashore-Poland, the SM-3 IIA program, and Sea Based Terminal defense. General Greaves kept the Agency on track to deliver the initial SM-3 Block IIA missiles developed in cooperation with Japan to support European phased adaptive approach, EPAA, phase 3. He oversaw the construction of the Aegis Ashore system in Poland in support of EPAA Phase 3 to improve European NATO defenses against medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles, which is expected to be delivered in 2020.

General Greaves has been a tireless advocate for the development and de-

ployment of a critically needed space sensor layer for hypersonic and missile defense, the need for which can be best summed by the general himself when he said: "If you can't see it, you can't shoot it." As a result of his efforts, the Congress continually funded the MDA to develop such a capability. In 2019, the general partnered with DARPA and the Air Force on the Hypersonic and Ballistic Tracking Space Sensor Program, which is now working with industry to reduce the key risks for this space sensor layer.

He also successfully completed the development and deployment of a network of sensor payloads hosted on commercial satellites, called Space-based Kill Assessment, or SKA. This program will collect data on missile intercepts, and inform the post-intercept assessment by the warfighter. This capability will provide the warfighter the option to adjust their shot doctrine to more efficiently manage interceptor inventory, thereby dramatically increasing the number of threats the system can engage for the defense of the homeland. In fact, when warfighters took part in simulations involving SKA they were so highly impressed by this new capability they requested it be made operational sooner than MDA had planned. The SKA program has been so impressive that the Department recently recognized MDA, under General Greaves leadership, for its acquisition success by presenting it with the Packard Award for Acquisition Excellence for the development of SKA.

General Greaves demonstrated his commitment to expand work with U.S. international partners, to include conducting joint analyses to support partner missile defense acquisition decisions, cooperative research and development projects, deploying BMD assets, foreign military sales, FMS, and coproduction efforts. Under General Greave's leadership, the Agency executed an historic FMS case with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for seven THAAD batteries and accompanying launchers, radars, and interceptors. In addition, he continued work on the co-development with Japan of the SM-3 Block IIA missile that will be deployed to the operational Aegis Ashore missile defense sites in Romania and Poland.

His exceptional leadership style influenced an organization of over 10,000 personnel across 13 time zones. These distinctive accomplishments of General Greaves are monumental. As he and his wife Patricia prepare for retirement, I want to thank them for their service to the United States of America—General Greaves and Patricia—Bravo Zulu.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH  
GUILLOTTE AND RICHARD  
"RICKY" MAZUR

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Elizabeth Guillotte

of Hill, NH, and Richard “Ricky” Mazur of Franklin, NH, as the May 2019 Granite Staters of the Month for their dedication to helping their classmates whose financial and/or family circumstances render them unable to afford basic necessities like clothing and toiletries.

When the Franklin High School FIRST robotics team sat down to discuss how they could give back to their community, Elizabeth and Richard had an idea: They could revamp the make-shift thrift shop at their school. Now, students at Franklin High School who are in need of anything from clothing, to toothbrushes, to cereal, can get all these items anonymously and for free at the new and improved “Karma Korner.”

Elizabeth and Richard were inspired to act after they noticed that some of their classmates were walking the halls in the same clothing that they wore the day before and learned that some classmates were eating their only meal of the day in the school cafeteria.

With the support of their FIRST Robotics teammates, the two students moved an already existing makeshift thrift shop to a wheelchair-accessible room with better lighting and brightly colored walls. They added food to the inventory of items available for students and started a program that allows students to bring home a backpack stuffed with pantry items so that they do not go hungry over the weekend.

Ensuring anonymity and, as a result, reducing stigma was important to Elizabeth and Richard. If a student wants to check out an item, all they need to do is record what they are taking on a clipboard, so that the students working the pantry know what needs to be replenished.

Many businesses in the surrounding communities have also lent their support in the form of gift cards or donated items. By collaborating with local businesses and charities, Karma Korner recently received washers and dryers for student use, which were bought and installed at no expense to the school.

In establishing Karma Korner, Elizabeth and Richard have recognized and elevated the dignity of their friends, peers, and classmates, and they have reminded us of our shared humanity and shared promise. I join the rest of the Franklin High School community in thanking Richard and Elizabeth for their efforts to help make their school a more supportive and welcoming place and congratulate them for being honored as May 2019’s Granite Staters of the Month.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM MEDD

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the efforts of Dr. William Medd and his work with Western Maine Health and Stephen’s Memorial Hospital. His dedicated work with MaineHealth, the largest health sys-

tem in Maine, has improved the lives and health of many residents of western Maine.

Although Bill is originally from Long Island, he has proudly called Maine home for almost five decades. He studied and specialized in Internal Medicine at Wesleyan University and then at the University of Rochester School of Medicine. Following his medical residencies and 2 years of service in the Air Force, Bill and his family relocated to western Maine in the early 1970’s.

Throughout his career, Bill has dedicated himself to improving the quality of healthcare in Maine, specifically in the rural area he has worked and lived. His efforts to achieve this goal have taken many forms, from serving as a trustee at Western Maine Health Care Corporation and MaineHealth to his 45 years as an internist in the Oxford Hills region. Perhaps one of the most symbolic aspects of Bill’s hard work is the growth of the local hospital in Norway, ME. At first a small facility when Bill arrived, it is now a fully equipped, modern hospital known as Stephen’s Memorial and provides quality healthcare to the rural region.

In early 2016, an expansion of Western Maine Health, was named the William L. Medd, MD, Health Center. This new facility integrated new models for delivering primary care and relocated other Western Maine Health units. For the last 3 years, Bill has had the unique opportunity to work out of the facility that bears his name.

On March 30 of this year, Bill was presented the Legacy Award at the Oxford Hills Chamber of Commerce annual dinner. Not only does this award embody Bill’s commitment to healthcare in Maine, but speaks to other contributions he has made to his community, from fundraising for local scholarships to supporting youth programs in the region. His work in these fields outside the medical profession demonstrate Bill’s commitment to more broadly improve his community.

I would like to thank Dr. Medd for his decade’s long work in the State of Maine. Thanks to his determination and drive to make a difference, the future of healthcare in western Maine is bright. Dr. Medd’s passion for his patients, community, and State sets an example for the medical professionals who will follow him.

Congratulations, Dr. Medd, on a successful career and happy retirement. I look forward to seeing your continued contributions to your community.●

#### 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF PITTSFIELD, MAINE

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the town of Pittsfield, ME, which is celebrating its 200th anniversary this year. Throughout its long history, Pittsfield has continually displayed a rich heritage of hard work, entrepreneurship, innovation, community, and family spirit. Situated along the Sebasticook River in Somerset

County, Pittsfield is home to roughly 4,200 residents who help make it a thriving Maine town.

Incorporated as Warsaw in 1819, the town became Pittsfield in 1824, named after one its prominent citizens, William Pitts. Early on, most of the town’s occupants were farmers, growing so much corn and wheat that they used the grains to pay their taxes. Like many Maine towns, Pittsfield began to develop a strong mill industry that flourished along the Sebasticook River. This assortment of textile, saw, and grist mills created hundreds of new jobs and Pittsfield saw its population nearly double in just 40 years. Closures and relocation of many of the town’s mills lead to some decline, but the citizens of Pittsfield helped reinvent the town, and today, Pittsfield is as vibrant as ever.

Maine Central Institute, an independent high school, opened in 1866 and continues to serve many of the town’s residents and foreign students from such countries as South Korea, Spain, Guatemala, and many more. The school’s Manson Essay contest continues to bring members of the community together every year to hear presentations by students on their university level research papers. Along with its high-level academics, MCI’s impressive athletic program has produced a number of professional athletes, many of whom have gone on to play professional basketball.

A hallmark of Pittsfield’s economy, Cianbro was founded by Carl Cianchette in 1946. Cianchette and his brothers would go on to grow this company into the largest construction company in Maine, providing thousands of jobs throughout the State. Now nationally recognized and 100 percent employee owned, with locations stretching into the mid-Atlantic region, Cianbro is still headquartered in Pittsfield.

It is an honor and a privilege to congratulate Pittsfield on this historic occasion. For 200 years the town and its residents have repeatedly demonstrated the hard work and community spirit found throughout Maine. I hope the residents of Pittsfield take the opportunity during this yearlong celebration to reflect on their rich history and strive to make the next 200 years as prosperous as the last. Happy 200th birthday, Pittsfield, and congratulations to all who have made this a vibrant Maine community.●

#### TRIBUTE TO T. MICHAEL PUTNAM

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Honorable T. Michael Putnam, who is formally stepping down from his 32-year term as a U.S. magistrate judge, effective on June 7, 2019. Judge Putnam served the Northern District of Alabama as a magistrate and chief magistrate judge during his many years of service to the court. He is the longest serving magistrate judge in the history of the



Northern District of Alabama, and I certainly commend him for this accomplishment. At the time of his appointment, Judge Putnam was the youngest magistrate judge in the country at age 32.

Instrumental in the expansion of the role of magistrate judges, Judge Putnam worked to highlight their value in the judicial process. He acted as the chair and vice chair of the Northern District's Criminal Justice Act Administrative Committee, playing a significant role in ensuring the highest quality of representation of indigent criminal defendants in the Northern District under the Criminal Justice Act.

Judge Putnam is widely known for his volunteer work at the Cumberland School of Law in Birmingham, AL. He has taught a pretrial practice and procedure class since 2006 and directed many trial advocacy and moot court programs. The Cumberland School of Law named Judge Putnam the 2019 recipient of the Friend of the Law School Award in recognition of his time and dedication to the betterment of students at Cumberland. The Young Lawyers Section of the Birmingham Bar Association also selected him for the Judge Drayton Nobles James Award in 2016, where they honored his spirit of volunteerism.

As an advocate for the Northern District, Judge Putnam played an active role in using technology to improve efficiency. He has been a judicial resource for the Office of the Clerk while implementing procedural changes to the electronic filing system. Judge Putnam led the Court in establishing the eVoucher system, making it easier for attorneys and courts to process vouchers for appointed counsel in criminal cases.

Judge Putnam received his bachelor of arts from the University of Alabama and his juris doctorate from the University of Alabama School of Law. He graduated in the top 5 percent of his class and was a Hugo L. Black Scholar.

Judge Putnam's contributions to Alabama's judicial system are truly remarkable and will have an impact for generations to come. I am proud to take this time to recognize and thank him for his service to the people of our great State and his unwavering commitment to the rule of law. I join Judge Putnam's friends, family, and colleagues in wishing him the best of luck as he transitions into a new chapter of his life.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:57 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, 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. 1200. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2019, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of cer-

tain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1812. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish Vet Center readjustment counseling and related mental health services to certain individuals.

H.R. 1947. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to exempt transfers of funds from Federal agencies to the Department of Veterans Affairs for nonprofit corporations established under subchapter IV of chapter 73 of such title from certain provisions of the Economy Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2045. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2326. An act to amend the Social Security Act, to amend the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012, and to direct the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Defense, Labor, and Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to take certain actions to improve transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces who separate, retire, or are discharged from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2333. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2340. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide to Congress notice of any suicide or attempted suicide of a veteran in a Department of Veterans Affairs facility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2359. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Veterans Affairs advancing of whole health transformation.

H.R. 2372. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of all memoranda of understanding and memoranda of agreement between Under Secretary of Health and non-Department of Veterans Affairs entities relating to suicide prevention and mental health services.

#### 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-1338. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL 9992-69-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1339. A communication from the Program and Management Analyst, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Miscellaneous Conservation Provisions" (RIN0578-AA69) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1340. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources; Appropriations; and Armed Services.

EC-1341. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hydroelectric Licensing Regulations Under the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018" ((RIN1902-AF59) (Docket No. RM19-6-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1342. 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; Georgia: Permit Exemption for Fire Fighting" (FRL No. 9993-89-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1343. 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; Georgia; Miscellaneous Revisions" (FRL No. 9994-14-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1344. 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; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL Area to attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9994-11-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1345. 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; Volatile Organic Liquid Storage Tank Rules" (FRL No. 9994-10-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1346. 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: Jefferson County Process Operations" (FRL No. 9993-90-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1347. 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; Massachusetts; Nonattainment New Source Review Program Revisions; Infrastructure Provisions for National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9993-84-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1348. 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; NC; Permitting Revisions" (FRL No. 9993-97-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1349. 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; Ohio; Revisions to

Particulate Matter Rules" (FRL No. 9994-12-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1350. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Missoula PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request" (FRL No. 9993-66-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1351. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule; NOx Ozone Season Group 2, NOx Annual, and SO2 Group 1 Trading Programs" (FRL No. 9993-69-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1352. 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 2019-0032 - 2019-0036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1353. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1354. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting proposed legislation relative to the responsibilities of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) within the General Services Administration (GSA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1355. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of Management and Budget, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1356. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2018 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1357. 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 Assistant Secretary/Director, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1358. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjusting Program Fees for the Student and Exchange Visitor Program" (RIN1653-AA74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1359. 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 "Core Values, Characteristics, and Customer Experience Principles of the Department" (RIN2900-AQ60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1360. A communication from the Assistant Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Annual Rate Publication for VA Educational Benefits" (RIN2900-AP99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-63. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia urging the United States Congress to pass funding legislation that will secure the southern border of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 114

Whereas, it is imperative that the United States Congress pass the laws needed to provide the necessary funding for securing the southern border of this great nation; and

Whereas, the growing crisis of illegal immigration threatens the security of United States citizens; and

Whereas, in 2017 and 2018 alone, approximately 235,000 illegal immigrants were arrested; more than half of those arrests were for violent crimes against Americans, 4,000 of whom were murdered; and

Whereas, each week, 300 Americans die of using heroin that comes to this country through drug smuggling at our southern border; and

Whereas, a high steel barrier along 234 miles of this nation's southern border would effectively prevent illegal immigrants and contraband from reaching the United States; and

Whereas, the Trump administration has requested \$5.7 billion for the construction of a steel barrier along the southern border, \$4.2 billion for detention center materials and personnel, \$563 million for additional immigration judges and support staff to reduce the backlog of immigration cases, \$211 million for additional border patrol agents, \$571 million for additional ICE personnel, and \$675 million to prevent illegal drugs and weapons from crossing our borders; and

Whereas, Congress has not yet responded to the Trump administration's request to secure the nation's southern border; and

Whereas, if Congress imposed a tariff on all moneys wired by individuals with no proof of citizenship or who are not in the country legally, it would provide the funding for the necessary infrastructure to secure the southern border: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate*, That the members of this body urge Congress to pass funding legislation that will make the security of the southern border of the United States a reality; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make appropriate copies of this resolution available for distribution to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the congressional delegation from this state.

POM-64. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia urging the United States Congress to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II Merrill's Marauders; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 466

Whereas, in August, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill proposed creation of a top-secret, "expendable" American ground unit to engage in a "long-range penetration mission" behind enemy lines in Japanese occupied Burma to cut off communications and supply lines and capture northern Burma's only strategic, all-weather Myitkyina airfield; and

Whereas, President Roosevelt issued a 1943 call for volunteers for "a dangerous and hazardous mission," answered by approximately 3,000 American Infantrymen from stateside, the Caribbean, and the South Pacific, representing 15 ethnic groups from every state and including a Bataan Death March survivor, Nisei interpreters, a Native American code talker, and Pearl Harbor survivors; and

Whereas, the top-secret unit, expecting no survivors, was officially designated in January, 1944, as the 5307th Composite Unit Provisional (CUP), code-named "Galahad," which later became known as "Merrill's Marauders," after their leader, Brigadier General Frank D. Merrill; and

Whereas, in February, 1944, the Marauders began their approximately 1,000 mile march through dense Burmese jungle and up the Himalayan Mountains with no artillery support, carrying only what they could pack on their backs or mules, and would become the first Americans to engage the Japanese on the ground in Asia and the first Americans to fight there since the 1900 Boxer Rebellion; and

Whereas, the Marauders fought valiantly during their five-month march to the Myitkyina airfield, defeating the much larger and better equipped elite Japanese 18th Division in five major and 30 minor engagements, and no other WWII U.S. combat force, except the First Marine Division which took and held Guadalcanal for four months, experienced as much uninterrupted jungle fighting; and

Whereas, the Marauders endured starvation, disease, monsoons, and isolation, which were exacerbated by inadequate aerial resupply drops, and malaria, typhus, dysentery, and other jungle maladies inflicted more casualties on the Marauders than the Japanese; and

Whereas, only several hundred Marauders remained fit enough, after climbing the Himalaya's disease infested, 6,100 foot Naura Hkyat Pass, to seize their objective of the Myitkyina airfield, which enabled supplies to be flown into Burma to connect the Ledo and Burma roads so a crucial Allied pathway could be forged into China; and

Whereas, on August 10, 1944, when the 5307th CUP was deactivated, without even a formation, only about 100 skeletal-looking Merrill's Marauders were left in Burma with the remainder evacuated due to jungle diseases, exhaustion, and malnutrition; and

Whereas, for their bravery, sacrifice, and success, Merrill's Marauders were awarded numerous medals and decorations, including the Presidential Unit Citation, and each member of the 5307th CUP has the "rare distinction" of being awarded a Bronze Star; and

Whereas, although Merrill's Marauders were a short-lived commando unit, the legacy of their bravery is honored by the Army's 75th Ranger Regiment, which traces its lineage to the 5307th CUP, wears the Merrill's Marauders patch as their crest, and named their military intelligence building "Melillo Hall" in honor of Georgia's last original Merrill's Marauder, Vincent Melillo; and

Whereas, Georgia is honored to commemorate 2019 as the 75th anniversary of the Merrill's Marauders mission in the China Burma India Theater, known today as the Forgotten Theater of WWII, and salutes the state's large Ranger presence: the 75th Ranger Regiment, 3rd Ranger Battalion, and Airborne Ranger Training Brigade, all at Ft. Benning; Camp Merrill in Dahlonga; and 1st Ranger Battalion, Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah; and

Whereas, U.S. Representative Peter T. King (R-NY) introduced H.R. 906 with Congressman Sanford Bishop (D-GA) as a major cosponsor, and U.S. Senator Johnny Isakson (R-GA) introduced S. 743 in the 116th Congress, the "Merrill's Marauders Congressional Gold Medal Act," and this third attempt might be the last since only 13 out of the original 3,000 Merrill's Marauders are still living:

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate*, That the members of this body commend the 75th anniversary of the WWII Merrill's Marauders mission and urge the Congress of the United States to act favorably on legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor Congress can bestow, to Merrill's Marauders; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make appropriate copies of this resolution available for distribution to President Donald J. Trump, Vice President Michael Pence, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, and each senator and representative from Georgia in the Congress of the United States.

POM-65. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee memorializing its support for the enactment of legislation that requires all board committee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors to be open to the public; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 192

Whereas, established in 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is a corporate agency of the United States that provides electricity for business customers and local power companies, serving ten million people in parts of seven southeastern states; and

Whereas, TVA also provides flood control, navigation, and land management for the Tennessee River system and assists local power companies and state and local governments with economic development and job creation; and

Whereas, Tennessee Congressman Tim Burchett has introduced the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019, legislation to require that committee meetings and subcommittee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors be transparent and open to the public; and

Whereas, the bill would amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 Section 2(g)(2) to include a provision on transparency that would require meetings of the TV A Board to be held in public, properly noticed, and with minutes and summaries of each meeting made available; and

Whereas, it is vitally important to the citizens of Tennessee that TVA, as an entity cre-

ated and protected by Congress, should conduct their business in the open and be as transparent as possible; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Eleventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee*, the House of Representatives concurring, That we strongly support the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019; and be it further

*Resolved*, That an appropriate copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted to the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and each member of Tennessee's delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-66. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee memorializing its support for the enactment of legislation that requires all board committee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors to be open to the public; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 192

Whereas, established in 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is a corporate agency of the United States that provides electricity for business customers and local power companies, serving ten million people in parts of seven southeastern states; and

Whereas, TVA also provides flood control, navigation, and land management for the Tennessee River system and assists local power companies and state and local governments with economic development and job creation; and

Whereas, Tennessee Congressman Tim Burchett has introduced the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019, legislation to require that committee meetings and subcommittee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors be transparent and open to the public; and

Whereas, the bill would amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 Section 2(g)(2) to include a provision on transparency that would require meetings of the TVA Board to be held in public, properly noticed, and with minutes and summaries of each meeting made available; and

Whereas, it is vitally important to the citizens of Tennessee that TVA, as an entity created and protected by Congress, should conduct their business in the open and be as transparent as possible; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Eleventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee*, the House of Representatives concurring, that we strongly support the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019; and be it further

*Resolved*, That an appropriate copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted to the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and each member of Tennessee's delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-67. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia urging the United States Congress to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS); to the Committee on Finance.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 276

Whereas, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease; and

Whereas, ALS is a progressive and fatal neuromuscular disease; and

Whereas, the average time to diagnosis is more than 12 months; and

Whereas, the majority of ALS patients die within two to five years of receiving a diagnosis; and

Whereas, approximately 6,000 people in the United States are diagnosed with ALS each year; and

Whereas, the incidence of ALS is two per 100,000 people, and it is estimated that more than 20,000 Americans may be living with ALS at any given time; and

Whereas, ALS occurs through the world with no racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic boundaries and can affect anyone; and

Whereas, military veterans are approximately twice as likely to develop ALS; and

Whereas, the onset of ALS often involves muscle weakness or stiffness as early symptoms. Progression of weakness, wasting, and paralysis of the muscles of the limbs and trunk, as well as those that control vital functions such as speech, swallowing, and later breathing, generally follows; and

Whereas, there can be significant costs for medical care, equipment, and home health caregiving later in the disease; and

Whereas, under current law, individuals must wait five months after becoming disabled before their Social Security Disability Insurance benefit payments can begin; and

Whereas, last year, Congress considered legislation that would eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals with ALS, but it unfortunately did not become law; and

Whereas, this body recognizes that persons living with ALS cannot wait for benefits. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate* that this body urges Congress to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS). Be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make appropriate copies of this resolution available for distribution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congressional delegation from this state.

POM-68. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Disability Integration Act of 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, the Disability Integration Act of 2019 has been introduced as S. 117 and H.R. 555 in the One Hundred Sixteenth United States Congress; and

Whereas, in enacting the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (herein referred to as the "ADA"), Congress recognized that "historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem" and intended that the ADA assure "full participation" and "independent living" for individuals with disabilities by addressing "discrimination against individuals with disabilities [that] persists in critical areas", including institutionalization; and

Whereas, while Congress expected that the ADA's integration mandate would be interpreted in a manner that ensures that individuals who are eligible for institutional placement are able to exercise a right to community-based long-term services and supports, that expectation has not been fulfilled; and

Whereas, the holdings of the Supreme Court in *Olmstead v. LC*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), and companion cases, have clearly articulated that individuals with disabilities, have a civil right under the ADA to participate in

society as equal citizens; however, many states still do not provide sufficient community-based long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities to end segregation in institutions; and

Whereas, the right to live in the community is necessary for the exercise of the civil rights that the ADA was intended to secure for all individuals with disabilities and the lack of adequate community-based services and supports has imperiled the civil rights of all individuals with disabilities, and has undermined the very promise of the ADA; therefore, it is necessary to recognize in statute a robust and fully articulated right to community living; and

Whereas, states, with a few exceptions, continue to approach decisions regarding long-term services and supports from social welfare and budgetary perspectives, but for the promise of the ADA to be fully realized, states must approach these decisions from a civil rights perspective; and

Whereas, states have not consistently planned to ensure sufficient services and supports for individuals with disabilities, including those with the most significant disabilities, to enable individuals with disabilities to live in the most integrated setting and, as a result, many individuals with disabilities who reside in institutions are prevented from residing in the community and individuals with disabilities who are not in institutions find themselves at risk of institutional placement; and

Whereas, the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary institutionalization denies individuals with disabilities the opportunity to live and participate on an equal basis in the community and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary spending related to perpetuating dependency and unnecessary confinement: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Disability Integration Act of 2019; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-69. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana commending finalists of the annual international environmental poetry and art contest sponsored by the River of Words; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 89

Whereas, River of Words is a non-profit arts and environmental education program, founded in 1995 by then United States Poet Laureate, Robert Hass and writer Pamela Michael, which annually, in affiliation with the Library of Congress Center for the Book, conducts an international poetry and art contest; and

Whereas, the River of Words contest is considered by educators as one of the most prestigious contests in the country, and

Whereas, poems written by the five outstanding students from the Greater Baton Rouge area, the only Louisiana finalists, were selected from tens of thousands of entries received from the United States and many other countries; and

Whereas, the natural world as seen through the eyes of its children is heartening, humbling, fresh, and life-affirming; and

Whereas, the watershed art and poetry submitted to River of Words is exhibited around the globe and is seen by millions of people each year; and

Whereas, every poem contributes to an informed appreciation of the natural world and the interconnectedness of all beings; and

Whereas, the five student finalists in this prestigious contest have demonstrated with their effort and their words an extraordinary level of skill and talent as writers and a finely discerning eye for the wonder of the natural world; and

Whereas, Connie McDonald, teacher at Louisiana State University Laboratory School and Wes Dannreuther, teacher at Broadmoor Middle Magnet School have nurtured a new generation and in turn have produced imaginative, informed, and heartfelt earth stewards, prepared to address the significant environmental and social challenges of the Twenty-First Century.

*Therefore, Be it Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby commends Haley Binder for her winning poem entitled "Starting Sundays," Billy Creed for his winning poem entitled "Berwick," Rafael Espinoza for her winning poem entitled "Nature Sleeps," Daniel Koepp for his winning poem entitled "Beyond My Window," and Christina Welsch for her winning poem entitled "Wet Nurse"; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby commends Connie McDonald and Wes Dannreuther for not only sharing their talents with these students, but for teaching them respect for and an understanding of the natural world, as well; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to Haley Binder, Billy Creed, Rafael Espinoza, Daniel Koepp, Christina Welsch, Connie McDonald, and Wes Dannreuther.

POM-70. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia memorializing its support of ongoing and continued development of West Virginia's energy resources, pipeline, and energy infrastructure; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, West Virginia's natural gas and energy reserves and production have increased significantly in recent years due to the exploration occurring in the Utica and Marcellus Shale formations; and

Whereas, West Virginia is now the ninth-largest natural gas producing state in the nation, providing five percent of our country's total energy; and

Whereas, The natural gas and oil industry supported over 70,000 jobs both directly and indirectly and added \$8 billion to the West Virginian economy; and

Whereas, Pipelines and transmission lines serve a critical role in delivering natural gas, petroleum, and electricity in order to meet our growing energy needs; and

Whereas, Denying the expansion and construction of existing and new pipeline projects would stop the significant revitalization of communities and manufacturing industries in West Virginia; and

Whereas, The U.S. Department of Energy has identified the benefits that West Virginia can accrue with the establishment of an ethane storage and distribution hub to promote diversity of supply and geography, alleviating the strategic risk our country faces as a result of a lack of redundancy and flexibility; and

Whereas, West Virginia is business friendly and welcomes investments in the state and local economy; and

Whereas, West Virginia's neighbors, including Ohio and Pennsylvania, have benefitted from using natural gas to attract industry; and

Whereas, The natural gas intensive industry sector in Ohio has an output of \$160 bil-

lion and Pennsylvania has an output of \$156 billion in comparison to West Virginia's output of \$18 billion; and

Whereas, Ohio and Pennsylvania have over 300,000 jobs in natural gas intensive industry sector while West Virginia has over 30,000 jobs in the natural gas intensive industry sector; therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Delegates*:

That we, the members of the House of Delegates of the 84th Legislature of the State of West Virginia, support the ongoing and continued development of West Virginia's energy resources, pipeline, and energy infrastructure in the State of West Virginia; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That we, the members of the House of Delegates of the 84th Legislature of the State of West Virginia, support ongoing economic development efforts to attract end-users of electricity and natural gas to expand our state's economy and create family sustaining jobs; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That the Clerk transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the West Virginia Congressional delegation, and the news media of West Virginia.

POM-71. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia memorializing its support of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others are critical to the economic and energy future of the State of West Virginia, providing our state's natural gas production with unprecedented access to new markets; and

Whereas, Studies indicate construction and operation of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline alone will generate massive economic benefits for West Virginia, including almost \$478 million in additional economic activity during the construction period and more than \$15 million in additional economic activity each year after the facility begins operating; and

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others will create thousands of new job opportunities for the working men and women of West Virginia and significant new tax revenues for many West Virginia counties; and

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others will help promote our nation's energy independence, helping make the burgeoning natural gas production in West Virginia and adjacent states more available to millions of consumers and reducing the need for energy imports; and

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline's environmental impact has been repeatedly and thoroughly analyzed by state and federal agencies, including the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the U.S. Forest Service, among others, with all of the agencies finding that the project can be built and operated in a manner that protects the natural resources of West Virginia and the other states in its path; and

Whereas, Despite the enormous energy and economic benefits, as well as the positive findings from a broad range of environmental regulatory agencies, some groups have launched an all-out assault on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline project, with the ultimate aim of forcing its cancellation; and

Whereas, These attacks are not based on the facts regarding the Atlantic Coast Pipeline but are part of what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce describes as a nationwide "keep it in the ground" strategy by some groups to

end all uses of fossil fuels in power generation; and

Whereas, These unwarranted attacks have resulted in regulatory and legal proceedings that have repeatedly delayed both the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and the related Supply Header Project; and

Whereas, In response to court orders stemming from these attacks, the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project have been forced to lay off or delay hiring thousands of skilled construction workers in West Virginia and also in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia and North Carolina, posing significant hardships for working families and depriving them of paychecks and steady work; and

Whereas, The U.S. Chamber of Commerce report estimates that these delays, through August 2018, have already resulted in the loss of \$2.3 billion in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product as well as \$500 million in lost tax revenue for U.S. states and localities; and

Whereas, The Chamber's study also found that the delays have already deprived U.S. consumers of \$377 million in energy cost savings; and

Whereas, The General President of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA) recently said obstructions to the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other vital energy infrastructure "from activist groups is costing our members jobs and the entire country opportunities"; and

Whereas, The LIUNA General President also emphasized that the economic damage caused by this opposition to new energy projects is "being shouldered by the hard working men and women who build our nation's energy infrastructure"; and

Whereas, These assaults and delaying tactics are also a direct threat to West Virginia's energy production industry, which directly employs more than 22,000 men and women and pays more than \$6 billion in wages annually; and

Whereas, Although the current employment and payroll figures are impressive, further growth will be severely hampered unless new infrastructure such as the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other pipelines are built to transport West Virginia's energy production to market; and

Whereas, In addition to this economic damage, the attacks on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other interstate natural gas projects have great potential to harm the environment, since other forms of electric generation powered by fossil fuels, such as natural gas, are needed to back up the expansion of the intermittent generation from renewable resources such as solar and wind energy; therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Delegates:* That we, the members of the House of Delegates of the 84th Legislature of the State of West Virginia, categorically condemn these counterproductive and economically damaging assaults on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other urgently needed energy infrastructure projects; and, be it further

*Resolved,* That we note that these attacks are denying steady employment and income to thousands of West Virginia workers and their families who would otherwise be employed in the construction and operation of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and the related Supply Header Project; and, be it further

*Resolved,* That we find that the attacks are also damaging West Virginia's energy production industry, the source of more than \$6 billion annually in wages to our state's working men and women; and, be it further

*Resolved,* That we find that the assaults on these projects have great potential to damage the environment by hindering the deployment of electric generation powered by solar power, wind and other renewable re-

sources, all of which must be backed up with fossil fuel powered generation, such as natural gas; and, be it further

*Resolved,* That we strongly urge the groups spearheading these assaults to stop their attacks and delaying actions and in the process help pave the way for a cleaner and stronger energy future for West Virginia and for the entire nation; and, be it further

*Resolved,* That the Clerk transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the West Virginia Congressional delegation, and the news media of West Virginia.

POM-72. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging the United States Congress to pass Savanna's Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3041

Whereas, homicide is the third leading cause of death among American Indian and Alaska Native women between 10 and 24 years of age and the fifth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age; and

Whereas, in some tribal communities, American Indian women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average; and

Whereas, Native American and Alaska Native women are at least two times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault and two and one-half times more likely to experience violent crimes compared to all other races, and those factors often are tied to cases involving a disappearance or murder; and

Whereas, the National Crime Information Center reported 5,712 cases of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women and girls in 2016, yet the United States Department of Justice's federal missing persons database only logged 116 cases; and

Whereas, in 2016, North Dakota had 125 cases of Native American women and girls reported missing to the National Crime Information Center, with many cases likely going unreported; and

Whereas, Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, for whom the federal legislation is named, was a member of the Spirit Lake Tribe and vanished when she was eight months pregnant; and

Whereas, Savanna's Act will improve tribal access to federal crime information databases on missing persons and cooperation among tribal, federal, state, and local law enforcement, and will mandate the Attorney General consult with tribes and submit a report to Congress on how to resolve the barriers tribes face; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein,* That the Sixty-sixth Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to pass Savanna's Act; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, and each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1321. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

S. 1328. A bill to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 1589. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Jeffrey L. Eberhardt.

Post: Special Representative for Nuclear Nonproliferation.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: Jeffrey T. and Michelle Eberhardt: none; Joshua and Stefanie Eberhardt: none; Grant McElwaine (ss): none; Heather Leigeberger (wife of Grant): none; Andrew McElwaine (ss): deceased.

4. Parents: Richard Eberhardt: \$50, 10/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$35, 8/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$35, 7/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$35, 4/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$25, 10/2016, Russ for Wisconsin: \$25, 10/2016, Russ for Wisconsin. Esther Eberhardt: none.

5. Grandparents: Earnest and Aleda Eberhardt—deceased; Leroy and Marie Still—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard A. Eberhardt, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

Kenneth A. Howery, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Sweden.

Nominee: Kenneth Alan Howery.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Sweden.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$2,000, Oct 7, 2016, Tiberi for Congress (Patrick J. Tiberi).

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Charles Kenneth Howery, none; Karen Elaine Howery, none.

5. Grandparents: Fred Charles Howery—deceased for more than 5 years; Dorothy Ann Howery—deceased, none; Hubert Robert Jurek—deceased for more than 5 years; Alice Albina Jurek—deceased for more than 5 years.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.  
7. Sisters and Spouses: Christina Ann Howery, none; John Phillip McLellan, none.

Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Slovak Republic.

Nominee: Bridget A. Brink.  
Post: Slovak Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: Bridget A Brink, None.
2. Spouse: Nicholas B. Higgins \$100, 10/05/16, Hillary for America.
3. Children and Spouses: Jack M. Higgins (minor), None; Cole A. Higgins (minor), None.
4. Parents: Gwendolyn D. Brink, None; John C. Brink, None.
5. Grandparents: Donald M. Brink, Deceased; Margaret Brink, Deceased; Robert J. Williams, Deceased; Cecelia Williams, Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses:
7. Sisters and Spouses: Joanna Brink, None.

John Jefferson Daigle, of Louisiana, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cabo Verde.

Nominee: Daigle, John Jefferson ("Jeff").  
Post: Cabo Verde.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: Cuenca-Daigle, Matthew Tito: none.
3. Children and Spouses: NA.
4. Parents: Daigle, Warren Roland (father)—deceased; Daigle, Carole Kaye (mother), none.
5. Grandparents: Gordon, Katherine Marie (grandmother)—deceased; Evans, John Murray Evans (grandfather)—deceased; Daigle, O'Neal James, Sr. (grandfather)—deceased; Daigle, Eva Coureges (grandmother)—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Daigle, Douglas James (brother), none; Daigle, Wanda Sue (spouse)—deceased.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Duplechin, Cheryl Marie (sister), none; Duplechin, Daniel Joseph, Sr. (spouse)—deceased; Thibodeaux, Nancy Gayle (sister), none; Thibodeaux, David Wayne (spouse), none; Tortorich, Melissa Eve (sister), none; Thibodeaux, Patricia Daigle (sister), none; Thibodeaux, Danny Paul (spouse), none; Daigle, Peggy Anne (sister), none; Daigle, Janet Elizabeth (sister)—deceased; LeJeune, Dawn Daigle (sister), none; LeJeune, Tommy Jason (spouse), none; Schexnaydre, Katherine Daigle (sister), none; Schexnaydre, Lance Paul (spouse), none; Perera, Shane Elizabeth (sister), none; Perera, Jeremy Paul (spouse), none; Hannegan, Eva Daigle (sister), none; Hannegan, Jason Paul (spouse), none.

Matthew S. Klimow, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to

be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkmenistan.

Nominee: Matthew S. Klimow.

Post: Ambassador to Turkmenistan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Edith Gunnels: \$50, 4/15/2018, Lisa Lloyd 4 Congress; \$250, 6/16/2017, Fairfax County Republican Committee.
3. Children and Spouses: Daniel A.T. Klimow (Son), None; Mrs. Elizabeth Klimow (nee Finan), None.
4. Parents: Stephen Klimow—deceased since 2007; Dorothy Klimow—deceased since 2003.
5. Grandparents: Matthew Klimow—deceased since 1936; Elizabeth Klimow—deceased since 1945; Anthony Dyjur—deceased since 1980; Frances Dear—deceased since 1981.
6. Brothers and Spouses: No Brothers.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Susan Klimow Micks (Sister), None; John Micks (Brother in law), None.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kenneth H. Merten and ending with Kevin M. Whitaker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2019.

Foreign Service nomination of Lisa Anne Rigoli.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Timothy Ryan Harrison and ending with Rachel Lynne Vanderberg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2019.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### 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. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1585. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide students with disabilities and their families with access to critical information needed to select the right college and succeed once enrolled; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1586. A bill to abolish the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1587. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1588. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Federal Switchblade Act to allow domestic manufacturers to ship and sell their products to buyers located in other States, to permit the importation of certain knife parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1589. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1590. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself,

Ms. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1591. A bill to nullify the effect of the Executive order that makes the vast majority of unauthorized individuals priorities for removal and aims to withhold critical Federal funding to sanctuary cities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 1592. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide a safe harbor for financial institutions that maintain a customer account or customer transaction at the request of a Federal or State law enforcement agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1593. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, a demonstration program, and a technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1594. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for unlimited eligibility for health care for mental illnesses for veterans of combat service during certain periods of hostilities and war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1595. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to limit overdraft fees and establish fair and transparent practices related to the



marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1596. A bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, and to establish a commission to review large agriculture, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, concentration, and market power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1597. A bill to designate certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to authorize certain land exchanges in the State of Oregon, and to convey certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Oregon to the city of Mitchell, Oregon, and Wheeler County, Oregon, for economic and community development purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1598. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 1599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable tax credit for foster families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1600. A bill to support States in their work to end preventable morbidity and mortality in maternity care by using evidence-based quality improvement to protect the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period and to reduce neonatal and infant mortality, to eliminate racial disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1601. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. KING):

S. 1602. A bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1603. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail, and at-risk individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1604. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to nonpoint source management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1605. A bill to make available necessary disaster assistance for families affected by major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1606. A bill to ensure the digital contents of electronic equipment and online accounts belonging to or in the possession of United States persons entering or exiting the United States are adequately protected at the border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1607. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide protections for patients scheduling non-emergency procedures at in-network hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1608. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1609. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1934 to require country-by-country reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the global intangible low-taxed income by repealing the tax-free deemed return on investments and determining net CFC tested income on a per-country basis; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1611. A bill to ensure appropriate prioritization, spectrum planning, and interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1612. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1613. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to update and modernize the reporting requirements for contaminants, including lead, in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1614. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the definition of "renewable bio-

mass" under the renewable fuel program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1615. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide compensation and credit for retired pay purposes for maternity leave taken by members of the reserve components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1616. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to improve the Social Security Administration's procedures to close or reduce access to field offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the listing of patents in the Orange Book; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1618. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the capacity to improve health outcomes and increase access to specialized care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1619. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national campaign to raise awareness of the importance of, and combat misinformation about, vaccines in order to increase vaccination rates; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1620. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1621. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of good or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for distributions from 529 accounts for expenses associated with registered apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1624. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to improve services for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and their families; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1625. A bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1626. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to estimate the value of electromagnetic spectrum assigned or otherwise allocated to Federal entities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 218. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) 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. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.

S. 237

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 237, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 249, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 400

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 400, a bill to gather information about the illicit production of illicit fentanyl in foreign countries and to withhold bilateral assistance from countries that do not have emergency scheduling procedures for new illicit drugs, cannot prosecute criminals for the manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues, or do not require the registration of tableting machine and encapsulating machines.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 429, a bill to require the establishment of exchange programs relating to cybersecurity positions between the private sector and certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 640, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require phar-

macy-negotiated price concessions to be included in negotiated prices at the point-of-sale under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 679

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefit paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

S. 784

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 784, 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.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) 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. 852

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes.

S. 943

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 943, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide capacity-building assistance to institutions of higher education to examine and address inequities in college student access and success, and for other purposes.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 952

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1015, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish additional criteria for determining when employers may join together in a group or association of employers that will be treated as an employer under section 3(5) of such Act for purposes of sponsoring a group health plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to provide that 12 weeks of leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes.

S. 1200

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1200, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

S. 1210

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1235

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1235, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving women in the United States the right to vote.

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1235, supra.

S. 1258

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1258, a bill to prohibit the sale of tobacco products to individuals under the age of 21.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens, and for other purposes.

S. 1337

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1337, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish an Office of Correctional Education, and for other purposes.

S. 1340

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1340, a bill to authorize activities to combat the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend title XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program for low-income mothers.

S. 1394

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1394, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1403

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 1416

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug

product manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to require health insurance coverage for the treatment of infertility.

S. 1500

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve and enhance protections for members of the Armed Forces who are victims of a sex-related or domestic violence offense, and for other purposes.

S. 1506

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1506, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit certain individuals complying with State law to possess firearms.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to protect the privacy of internet users through the establishment of a national Do Not Track system, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. RES. 135

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 135, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and valor by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending those individuals for leadership and bravery in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 217, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 7 through June 9, 2019, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Weekend" and June 2019 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 1599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable tax credit for foster families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Foster Care Tax Credit Act, with my colleague Senator Jones. Enacting this bill would go a long way towards helping families with the expenses that come with taking in and providing homes for foster children.

Currently, foster families are only eligible for the Child Tax Credit if the same child lives with them for at least six months. Many foster families take in children for shorter periods, and sometimes take in multiple different children throughout the year. Even if these placements add up to more than six months, these families are potentially not eligible for the tax credit. Further, state funding for foster care families often fails to cover the cost of meeting the child's basic needs.

The Foster Care Tax Credit Act would create a new refundable tax credit targeted at these families that take in foster children but are not eligible for the Child Tax Credit. The tax credit would help ease the financial strain that many of these families face. Further, the bill instructs the Secretary of Health and Human Services and Secretary of the Treasury to conduct outreach to state and tribal agencies to better educate foster families about provisions of the tax code that may benefit them.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill to provide assistance to families who have chosen to offer a loving home for children who need it most.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1614. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the definition of "renewable biomass" under the renewable fuel program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Oregonians have a strong interest in using biomass as a source of renewable fuels. This desire, coupled with how well we grow biomass in Oregon, creates the opportunity to use carefully selected wood waste as a source for cleaner transportation fuel. If we do it right, this effort will lead to healthier forests, more carbon sequestration, cleaner transportation fuels as compared to traditional gasolines, and protected old growth forests.

Current law excludes the use of federal biomass in the making of renewable fuels as defined by the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS). The bill being introduced today eliminates that exclusion.

In addition to being an energy matter, this is an important forest management issue. Over many decades there has been an unnatural buildup of woody material on the forest floor. It

becomes fuel for catastrophic wildfires. For months, each summer, Oregonians in every corner of the state, from Astoria to Adel and from Medford to Madras, suffer from smokey skies, hazardous air quality, and the almost constant threat that a wildfire may burn down their homes. In the eastern portion of the state, invasive species like juniper trees pose challenges, on both private and public lands—lowering water tables, posing fire risks, and encroaching on sage grouse habitat. It is time we stopped putting our heads in the sand, hoping the environmental ship will right itself.

Instead, this excess woody biomass should be contributing to U.S. energy independence by being converted to transportation or electricity fuels. This bill makes that economically feasible. It would make it more cost efficient for private landowners to remove low-value brush, like juniper. The bill also helps pay for programs to reduce dead and dying trees that fuel catastrophic wildfires and helps thin out unhealthy second-growth forests. The bill ensures that all residuals from the milling process and certain biomass from national forests and BLM forests qualify for the RFS standards.

Importantly, under this new definition biomass materials harvested from federal lands must be done so in accordance with all federal laws, regulations, and land-use plans and designations. In addition, the bill pays specific attention to biomass removal from insect and disease ridden forests and wildfire prone areas. And, to ensure environmental problems are being solved, not created, the bill restricts the types of biomass materials that can be harvested from federal lands so that old growth trees and stands will continue to be protected.

At the end of the day, the small diameter trees, the limbs, the debris, even sawdust at the mill presents real opportunities to generate green energy, generate green jobs, lower wildfire risks in rural areas across the country, and better position the United States to meet the RFS.

There is a lot of bipartisan support for the biomass definition in this bill. It balances sound energy policy with sound environmental policy.

I want to thank my colleagues Senators RISCH, KING, CRAPO, and MERKLEY for joining me on this important bill.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. KING):

S. 1602. A bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Better Energy

Storage Technology Act. I am pleased to be partnering with Senator HEINRICH on this initiative. I would also like to thank Senator GARDNER, Senator SMITH, Senator COONS, Senator MCSALLY, and Senator KING who have joined us as original cosponsors of the BEST Act.

Our bipartisan bill supports narrowly tailored energy storage research to develop the next generation of technologies at the Department of Energy. Advancing next generation energy storage technology will allow us to integrate more renewables into the power grid, such as wind energy or solar energy which, in turn, will help to reduce emissions and slow climate change.

Energy storage systems provide a wide range of benefits. First, these technologies increase the reliability and the resilience of the electric grid by limiting potential disruptions. Energy storage helps us to better manage supply and demand on the grid and allows for the expanded use of renewable energy. The reliability of our grid and grid-scale storage systems go hand-in-hand.

Second, this type of technology can decrease energy costs, a goal that we all share. In Maine, the price of electricity rises steeply during the coldest days of the year. For example, in late 2017 and early 2018, very cold temperatures in New England led to higher energy costs—more than a billion dollars in the wholesale energy market—in just 15 days.

The next generation of energy storage technologies could help to transform our grid, meaning that we would no longer need to generate more expensive power to meet demands during the hottest and coldest days of the year. Instead, we could use more affordable energy sources that have been stored for later use.

Third, energy storage systems can allow for more intermittent renewable sources, such as wind and solar power, to be placed on the grid and used precisely when they are needed. The Aqua Ventus, a floating, deepwater offshore wind project being developed by the University of Maine and a consortium of groups, could benefit from energy storage innovation. Off the coast of Maine, there are very strong and consistent winds where offshore wind turbines can produce electricity almost 50 percent of the time. This next generation storage technology will ensure that we can use this wind power closer to 100 percent of the time by storing electricity to use when the wind isn't blowing.

One of the biggest hurdles to commercializing energy storage is cost. To overcome this obstacle, our bill specifically directs the Department of Energy to work to decrease the cost of this exciting technology. This is similar to the Department's SunShot initiative that decreased the price of solar power by approximately 75 percent in less than a decade.

Furthermore, energy storage systems are technology neutral. This bill will foster innovation and enhance deployment of these innovative technologies without picking winners or losers.

Specifically, our bill would do the following: It would focus energy storage research on highly flexible, longer duration, and seasonal storage systems. It would support five energy storage demonstration projects. The bill would create a strategic plan and allow the Department of Energy to develop cost targets. It would coordinate research and support the coordination of research. Finally, the bill would authorize \$60 million annually for each of the next 5 years.

I am pleased to report that our bipartisan bill has earned very broad support, including the endorsements of the Bipartisan Policy Center, Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions, ClearPath, Edison Electric Institute, Energy Storage Association, the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the National Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Council of Maine, the National Hydropower Association, Solar Energy Industries Association, the Union of Concerned Scientists, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Frankly, it has been a long time since I have seen a bill be able to attract that much support from groups that have different ideological goals, and I am very proud that we were able to line up the support of all of those groups.

The BEST Act will help advance energy storage technologies to improve the efficiency of our Nation's electrical grid while helping to promote the wider use of clean, renewable energy. The goals of this bill are those which I would hope every Member of this body could embrace. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 218—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AS AN IMPORTANT TIME TO CELEBRATE THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ASIAN AMERICANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 218

Whereas the people of the United States join together each May to pay tribute to the

contributions of generations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian American and Pacific Islander community is an inherently diverse population, composed of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian American population grew faster than any other racial or ethnic group over the last decade, surging nearly 72 percent between 2000 and 2015;

Whereas there are approximately 22,000,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Asian and approximately 1,600,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, making up nearly 7 percent of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month because the first Japanese immigrants arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from Chinese immigrants;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests the President to issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas 2019 marks several important milestones for the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, including—

(1) the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, a bicameral caucus of Members of Congress advocating on behalf of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, which, in 2019, is composed of 73 Members, including 19 Members of Asian or Pacific Islander descent;

(2) the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies, which was founded alongside the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus by former Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of Transportation Norman Y. Mineta and former Delegate to the United States House of Representatives from Guam Robert Underwood;

(3) the 40th anniversary of the first Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week, designated in 1979 by President Jimmy Carter through Presidential Proclamation No. 4650;

(4) the 45th anniversary of *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), in which the Supreme Court of the United States determined that inadequate supplemental language instruction for students of Chinese ancestry with limited English proficiency violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964, expanding equal educational opportunities and paving the way for bilingual programs and additional English language instruction in public schools;

(5) the 95th anniversary of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1924 (commonly known as the "Johnson-Reed Act") (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190), which imposed national origin quotas that limited the number of immigrants allowed entry to the United States and prohibited the entry of Asian immigrants; and

(6) the 150th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad, which—

(A) in 1869, connected the Central Pacific Railroad and the Union Pacific Railroad at Promontory Summit, Utah; and

(B) involved more than 12,000 Chinese laborers who faced racial and wage discrimination despite being entrusted with the most laborious tasks;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have made significant contributions to the United States at all levels of the Federal Government and the United States Armed Forces, including—

(1) Daniel K. Inouye, a Medal of Honor and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient who, as President Pro Tempore of the Senate, was the highest-ranking Asian American government official in the history of the United States;

(2) Dalip Singh Saund, the first Asian American Congressman;

(3) Patsy T. Mink, the first woman of color and Asian American woman to be elected to Congress;

(4) Hiram L. Fong, the first Asian American Senator;

(5) Daniel K. Akaka, the first Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry;

(6) Norman Y. Mineta, the first Asian American member of a Presidential cabinet; and

(7) Elaine L. Chao, the first Asian American woman member of a Presidential cabinet;

Whereas, in 2019, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are serving in State and Territorial legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including in—

(1) the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; and

(2) the Territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

Whereas, in 2019, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders honorably serve throughout the Federal judiciary;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of, and to understand the challenges faced by, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that Asian American and Pacific Islander communities enhance the rich diversity of and strengthen the United States.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 1:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Michael S. Bogren, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Jason K. Pulliam, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Frank William Volk, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of

West Virginia, and David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

##### 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, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

##### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow on Thursday, May 23, 2019.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:12 p.m., recessed until Thursday, May 23, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 2019:

##### THE JUDICIARY

HOWARD C. NIELSON, JR., OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH.

STEPHEN R. CLARK, SR., OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

CARL J. NICHOLS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

KENNETH D. BELL, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTES TO FORMER REP. RON DELLUMS BY HIS COLLEAGUES

**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, on Friday, May 10, 2019, the family, friends, and former colleagues of the late Rep. Ron Dellums of California paid tribute to him at a memorial service here in Washington. Several of us who served with him in this House delivered eulogies praising Rep. Dellums for his decency, his strength of character, his leadership, his dedication to the men and women who serve in our military, and the respect he earned from his fellow legislators on both sides of the aisle.

I want to take this opportunity to include in the RECORD the remarks I offered along with the kind words spoken by Rep. BARBARA LEE, Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, and Del. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. Majority Whip JAMES CLYBURN also spoke, although unfortunately there is no transcript of his remarks. I can attest, however, to his moving words.

Below I share with the rest of our colleagues my remarks in praise of our friend, the late Rep. Dellums, joined by the statements of others made in tribute to him:

Mr. Hoyer: Rev. Lamar and Father Conroy, thank you for your words of peace and reflection. Cynthia, Erik, Piper, Brandon, and Pam, thank you for allowing us to join you in mourning Ron and participating in this service today. To his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, let me say “thank you” for the love you gave him, because we all saw the joy it brought him.

I had the great honor to serve in congress with Ron Dellums for seventeen years. He was a friend, a teacher, an example, a hero. He was always a gentleman. He was kind, gracious, strong, and historic. Respected and admired by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

As Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Ron Dellums was a man who knew the purpose of arms. He understood that instruments of war could be guarantors of peace. And he knew that the greatest force was that of the moral being, the spirit of good will and powerful words used to speak truth.

When he saw the injustice of apartheid in South Africa, Ron fought with every fiber to arm Congress with truth and make our country an instrument of moral clarity.

When he and other African-American Members saw an opportunity to raise issues that were being ignored in Washington and lift up voices that weren't being heard, Ron helped create the Congressional Black Caucus that now serves as the conscience of the Congress.

As city councilman, he drew on his own family's experiences to see the clarity of his cause championing workers and their families, the downtrodden, the forgotten, and the dispossessed.

The people of Oakland elected Ron eleven times to congress and then made him their mayor—because they saw in him the kind of moral leader unafraid to stand up for prin-

ciples and determined to do right by those who entrusted him with high office. They knew he would always speak up for them and speak out for the causes he knew to be just.

Ron Dellums understood that the power of words speaking truth—on the Floor of the House or in Committee or in the City Council chamber or from the mayor's desk—could be mightier than any armament. He was a man who chose his words carefully and wielded them forcefully.

President John F. Kennedy said of Winston Churchill that he “marshalled the English language and sent it into battle.” So too did Ron. And we will remember him always for speaking truth, speaking justice, speaking goodness, and speaking for those who needed a voice.

He was regal in bearing. He was real in his relationships—warm and empathetic to all.

He was courageous in battle. Principled in his policies. Moral in vision. Worthy of leading. Courteous in demeanor. Clear in his goals. Loyal to his country, colleagues, and conscience. Deserving of our love and respect. A Teddy-Roosevelt “doer of great deeds.” And, most assuredly, a man to be admired, emulated, followed, and—as we do today, remembered.

Ron was our friend and our exemplar. We were honored and blessed to be a part of his life.

Ron: you were always faithful, Marine. You were “Semper Fi.”

Ms. Lee of California: To our officiant, Rev. William H. Lamar IV, Father Conroy, Reverend Skinner, and to all members of the clergy.

First, let me offer my deepest condolences to Cynthia, Brandy, Rachel, and Ron's entire family and extended family and Ron's staff who have and continue to experience a deep sense of grief, yet hope that through the celebration of Ron's life, we all can join together and keep his legacy alive through our work and love for each other.

I would also like to take a moment to acknowledge my colleagues; members here; Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, Majority Whip James Clyburn, Congresswoman Maxine Waters, Congressman Hank Johnson, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, Congressman Gregory Meeks, and Congresswoman Shelia Jackson Lee. Members, please stand.

Our former congressional colleagues.

And Ron's friends and constituents, and all program participants.

I thank you for being here today as we celebrate the life of a man who was a statesman, a gentleman, and an authentic representative of the people. Also, Ron was my mentor and my friend.

I looked up to him, like we all did, as a warrior, and a fighter.

Ron never gave up his principles and integrity, even though he was brilliant, a deep thinker, a philosopher, and a man who—as he would say—had a memory like an elephant. He was a psychiatric social worker who understood human behavior in its totality and a proud former marine who demonstrated that peace is patriotic.

He was a comedian too.

He was so funny—some of you may remember his Richard Pryor skit—Sandre, and I were with Ron when he played the role of Richard Pryor at Lou Gossett's house.

What an evening—Ron became Richard Pryor, and Richard Pryor became Ron.

Ron never let the weight of the world destroy his sense of humor and fun-loving side with his friends and family.

I first met Ron as a college student in the early 1970s. I was going to school, raising my two little boys while on public assistance and developing my political consciousness.

I wanted to be an Intern in Ron's Washington office once I was in graduate school at UC Berkeley. I went to Ron's District Director, our beloved, the late Don Hopkins who Ron relied on and loved deeply, with this request.

Don placed me in Ron's DC Office during the Watergate hearings in the summer of 1974. I learned a lot that summer, saw how Ron, as a progressive African American man from Berkeley and Oakland, navigated his work as a legislator. Even though—as he always reminded us—they painted him as a commie pinko from Berkeley and he was on Spiro Agnew's hate list—Ron wore this as a badge of honor. He knew he came to Congress as an Anti-war, peace candidate, who knew the priorities of our country were wrong and destroying people's lives here at home & abroad.

In 1975, I came to Washington, D.C. to work on Ron's staff. In those days, it was rare for a woman—let alone a black woman—to run a congressional office. But Ron was proud to call himself a “feminist” and lived his life by the same progressive values he espoused on the House floor.

As an ardent anti-war activist, he also sought a seat on the Armed Services Committee to advocate for alternatives to military intervention.

Years later, Ron went on to make history as the first African American to chair the Armed Services Committee—and he used that position to advocate for more just and humane military policies. I travelled with Ron, along with his staff throughout the world. Heads of State wanted his advice and knew he was a global leader.

I remember him telling his staff “Let your conscience be your guide. If you are right—just to stand on that street corner alone because sooner or later everyone must walk right to you.” I'd like to ask Ron's staff—Congressional and Mayoral—to stand. Ron loved his staff. They are all true public servants who gave their all to our community, the country, and the world.

Ron demonstrated this repeatedly—he introduced the South African sanctions legislation 13 times.

It was the first override of a presidential policy veto in the 20th century and finally put the United States on the right side of history.

I will always remember Ron calling me after I was elected to Congress to come to his beautiful home for dinner. Yes—he also was a great cook.

Well, we sat at his kitchen table and asked me to think about introducing an AIDS martial plan for Africa given the devastating HIV/AIDS pandemic in Africa. His idea led to my legislation establishing the global fund and PEPFAR which has saved millions of lives. He worked so hard to help me get these bills passed and the world owes him a debt of gratitude.

Ron was my boss, mentor, and yet, like the brother I never had. He gave me personal advice and support as a single Mom raising two boys.

• 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.

When my son Craig graduated from Brent Elementary School, in the sixth grade here in Washington, DC., he asked Ron to be the graduation speaker. Ron left Capitol Hill, spoke at the graduation, took pictures and spent time with the kids afterward. Mind you, they were young children. They didn't have any political clout and couldn't vote.

Ron did this out of the goodness of his heart because he loved children and cared about their future.

My sons Craig and Tony were childhood friends with Ron's kids Brandy, Eric, & Piper, and to this day they remain close friends.

Also, as a single woman in Washington, DC, Ron counseled me on who—and who not to date.

He saved me from a lot of trouble and heartbreaks.

We can't forget that Ron was nominated for President in the mid-70's, in Cincinnati, Ohio, but he declined the nomination for the Office of the President at the National Black Political Convention. Then there was an effort to draft him to run for president, in New York—I believe—in 1980.

Of course, he was conflicted—so was the staff. We just knew he could win—but Ron decided he wanted to continue serving his constituents because he wanted to help them achieve their dreams and aspirations.

And, as the father of Coalition politics, which began in the East Bay, his leadership was needed to continue to build coalitions for peace and justice around the country.

When Ron called me and told me of his illness, I was devastated. In his generous manner, he said he didn't want to worry me and was gentle and cautious in the way he told me—preparing me for that sad day. But he gave me time to be with him each week during his last month. Thank you, Cynthia.

I spent my birthday last year—the evening of July 16 after a legislative session—with Ron and his family. He was in rare form, telling stories, being the comedian that he was, toasting our friendship and singing Happy Birthday to me. He was frail, in pain, but demonstrated a sense of hope and courage—even as he knew he would meet his maker soon.

After my next visit, which would be the last, he talked about family and friends—told me some of his secrets, and I told him some of mine—encouraged me to keep fighting the good fight and imparted more pearls of wisdom.

As I was about to leave, I was reluctant to hug him, knowing he was in pain. He reared up in the bed and called me to him in his playful way and gave me a big hug with tears in his eyes.

As a brilliant, powerful, elected official, a fighter, and a physical fitness champion, Ron was also kind, gentle, and a humanitarian who lived his life with dignity and respect.

He left this earth demonstrating that same sense of dignity and courage.

He did it his way.

Ron passed me a blue baton when we announced in 1998 that I would run for his seat upon his retirement.

The baton, which I look at often, reminds me that all of us must carry that baton that Ron gave us and run our mile in this marathon for justice, for peace, and unity. So, when we can pass our batons to the next generation, we know, as Ron said frequently—we have secured their future. In honor of the great legacy Ron has left, I'll be introducing the Ronald V. Dellums Memorial Fellowship For Women Of Color In Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Math, and National Security Act. And we will get it passed.

Finally, let me say during moments like this, as a person, of faith, I go to the scriptures often for inspiration and hope.

2nd Timothy Chapter 4, verse 7 says: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, and I have kept the faith."

Ron, rest in peace, rest in power, know that we got your back.

Ms. Waters: By all standards, our brother, Ron Dellums, was a truly exceptional human being who consistently gave of himself to his loved ones, his community, his nation, and the entire world.

Reverend King wrote "The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands in times of challenge and controversy. In dangerous valleys and hazardous pathways, he will lift some bruised and beaten brother to a higher and more noble life."

In both his public and personal capacities, Ron embodied this standard of character, purpose, selflessness, and service.

As an elected official, Ron was a bold pioneer, a true leader, and a stalwart advocate for peace in the U.S. and globally. Fueled by his extraordinary acumen and legendary eloquence, he built a stellar track record of standing up for principle, righting the wrongs of inequality, and empowering the powerless.

Ron initiated his career in Congress as a crusader for peace, taking on the establishment by opposing the Vietnam War. He pressured Nixon to end the U.S. involvement, and exposed war crimes in Vietnam, earning him a place on Nixon's enemies list, of which he was proud to be a member.

Ron was a pioneer in the campaign to end apartheid in South Africa, proposing sanctions as far back as 1972. He was fiercely dedicated to opening hearts and minds in Congress to the plight of the oppressed South African majority. Together we fought apartheid, with my bill divesting California's pension fund investments, and Ron's bill divesting U.S. companies' assets and applying sanctions against the repressive regime, becoming law just days apart, in Ron's case by overriding the president's veto.

Ron called out racial discrimination in the military and advanced diversity and inclusion through innovations that opened doors of opportunity to people who had been excluded. He championed the minority set-aside program for Defense Department contracts, enabling businesses owned by African Americans, Latinos, and other minorities to compete for a share of the DoD's large procurement budget.

Ron consistently advocated for peace, opposing expensive, excessive weapons such as the B-2 stealth bomber, and the MX and Pershing II missiles. He called for funds for those weapons to be shifted to cities, communities, education, and housing. He opposed military intervention in Grenada, Zaire, Burundi, Sudan, Angola, Liberia, and elsewhere, and was an outspoken critic of the Persian Gulf War.

Ron's illustrious leadership was on display as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He maintained his commitment to peaceful policy positions while allowing the committee to work its will on the DoD's authorization and policies that he opposed. Ron often voted against his committee's legislation.

Ron's principled passion was epitomized by his speech from the well of the House supporting the Civil Rights Act of 1990. In that August 2, 1990 speech, which is still emblazoned on the minds of many, Ron implored his colleagues to support the bill, declaring "this is throw-down time. This is the bottom line. This is integrity. There is no substitute to freedom and human dignity . . . there is no substitute for justice."

Ron's nature was just as resplendent outside the public arena. To his friends and all who sought his counsel, he was a trusted

confidant, a source of strength, a bastion of wisdom, and a compatriot in our shared goals and dreams. His personal warmth, thoughtfulness, and empathy were as much a part of his essence as passion for peace. When facing conflict, he remained dignified. When confronting challenges, he remained optimistic. When engaging opponents, he remained congenial. Even his adversaries in Congress appreciated him for being fair, responsive, thoughtful, and honorable.

I am grateful that I had the chance to thank Ron for what he accomplished, represented, and taught us. Shortly after he left Congress, we celebrated him at the Black Women's Forum in L.A., not just because of what he did for his district and for the people of mine, but for all 435 districts. We enveloped him in so much appreciation and praise that day—every bit well-earned and well-deserved—that the eloquent orator was rendered speechless, albeit only briefly.

To me, Ron was far more than a colleague, compatriot, teammate, confidante, counselor, and political soul mate, although he was all that. To me, Ron was a true friend, a dear and trusted friend, a brother, and I loved him very much.

Ron Dellums will always be remembered as the true article; a man of conscience, dignity, and grace; a leader with the rare blend of sincere humility and sublime intellect; the peoples' patriot who waged peace at every opportunity; and a man who is admired and loved by more people, in more corners of the country and the world, than he could have imagined.

Ms. Norton: We celebrate our colleague and friend Ronald Dellums at a time of historic polarization in Congress. It is a good time to remember the peace advocate who chaired the Armed Services Committee with such equanimity that he won the respect, even the friendship, of those who opposed every cause, of the many into which Ron poured his considerable talent.

I first came to admire Ron even before being elected to Congress from my work in the Free South Africa anti-apartheid movement. For 14 years, Ron did not relent until he freed his landmark bill for South Africa divestment, overcoming a presidential veto.

By the time I was elected to Congress, Ron had already been chair of the District of Columbia Committee for more than a decade. That committee is long gone, and nothing would have pleased Chairman Dellums more than its demise. But when freedom-loving Ron Dellums first came to Congress, he knew that if there had to be such a Committee, he wanted a seat on it. Just as Ron sought peace by serving on the Armed Service Committee, he sought to free D.C. from Congressional control by serving on the D.C. Committee.

He joined the Committee during his very first term in Congress. Upon becoming chair of the D.C. Committee, Ron framed his service as "an advocate, not an overseer of District affairs." No sooner had Ron gotten to Congress in 1975, in his very 1st term, long before I even thought about becoming a Member, he introduced the 1st D.C. statehood bill.

Ron would relish our progress today as we close in on enough votes for the D.C. statehood bill to pass in the House this term. We expect a vote soon in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to send the bill to the House Floor. When that committee vote occurs, we will not be able to claim we are breaking new or historic ground. In 1987, more than 30 years ago Chairman Ron Dellums proclaimed "There should be no colonies in a democracy" and led the District Committee in a vote for statehood for the District of Columbia that passed in his Committee.

The American citizens who live in the nation's capital will forever remember Ron Dellums, prescient warrior for equality and freedom—and well ahead of his time—a leader for statehood for the District of Columbia.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE FILIPINO VETERANS FAMILY REUNIFICATION ACT OF 2019

## HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, today, with my colleague, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, I rise to introduce the Filipino Veterans Family Reunification Act. I also welcome the companion version of this bill introduced today in the U.S. Senate by Senator HIRONO of Hawai'i and Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska.

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would exempt immigrant visa applications of children of Filipino World War II veterans from existing caps and allow them to gain green cards on processing and approval of their applications, which are still carefully vetted in line with existing immigration standards. This bill will not only assist these veterans in their senior years but also provide a fitting recognition of their critical service in the War.

In 1941, more than 250,000 Filipino soldiers responded to President Roosevelt's call-to-arms in the Philippines and elsewhere and fought for the U.S. during World War II. Many of these brave individuals returned from the War only to be denied many of the benefits promised for their service, and they have spent decades fighting recognition of their service. Many such veterans became proud U.S. citizens, though today there are only a few thousand Filipino veterans still alive and living in the U.S.

In October 2017, Congress finally awarded the Filipino veterans of World War II the Congressional Gold Medal to honor their service to our country, but we must do more as we promised. These Filipino American veterans long sought to gain entry and citizenship for their children, yet our immigrant visa backlog has forced family members to wait up to decades and thus effectively prevented these aging veterans from reuniting with their families.

In 2016, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services created the Filipino World War II Veterans Parole Program, a temporary administrative fix that allows these veterans to request parole for their children or siblings. Under this policy, they can live in the U.S. pending processing of their permanent resident applications, which may still take years if not decades. However, as these veterans near the end of their lives, they deserve the certainty of a non-revocable permanent solution. This bill would grant them that.

In this Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and in further recognition of the selfless service and contributions of Filipino veterans of World War II to our country, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting and passing this bill.

# REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JIMMIE "JW" ALESHIRE

## HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jimmie "JW" Aleshire, age 73, who passed away on Thursday, November 1, 2018.

Jimmie was a proud veteran, serving his country in the U.S. Army 82nd Airborne Infantry. He was also a devout man of faith and was a member of St. Mary's Church in Mineral Ridge, Ohio. Prior to retirement in 2011, Jimmie worked as a steel worker for RMI for 38 years, and was a former 6S coordinator and continuous improvement facilitator at RTI International Metals, Inc.

Jimmie was also a fighter in more ways than one. He was a 36-year melanoma cancer survivor, volunteered his time with the Niles' Relay for Life, and served on the Board of Directors of Yellow Brick Place. He was also a great union man, a part of Local No. 2155, and served on school committees for both St. Rose and John F. Kennedy Warren Schools.

A family man, Jimmie was a beloved grandfather and coach. He was a track coach at St. Rose and a softball coach for JFK and Seaborn Elementary, while being instrumental in developing the ball fields at JFK Warren.

Survivors include his wife of 52 years, Joyce (Veltre) Aleshire, whom he married October 22, 1966; his children, Alise (Jason) Kent of Warren, Christian M. Aleshire of Alliance, and Justin (Crystal) Aleshire of Mineral Ridge; his grandchildren, Isabella and Michael Kent, Ryan, Noah, and Lucas Aleshire; his granddog, Furious, and many nieces.

Jimmie was a great friend of mine and was a one of my earliest supporters. He knew better than most the power of collective action to improve the lives of working-class people. Jimmie will be missed.

# HONORING THE LEGACY OF CAVEY'S

## HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Cavey's a restaurant located in Manchester, Connecticut.

Cavey's has been a mainstay on Connecticut's restaurant scene since it opened in 1933, during the Great Depression.

For 85 years the Cavagnaro family has created a welcoming environment with delicious food and great friendship.

As a frequent visitor of Cavey's, Steve Cavagnaro, the current owner and chef, and his wife Kate, have become dear friends. His grandmother, Florence, originally opened the restaurant, and Steve has continued to serve her famous ravioli.

Over the years, the Cavagnaro family has created a Manchester institution, where I met a cast of characters, starting with Steve's father, Stephen Cavagnaro Senior, and ranging from people like Raymond F. "Sonny"

Damato, Jack DeQuatro, Bill and Steve Thornton, Neil and Elizabeth Ellis, Chris Powell, and Bob Marcotte, who coined the phrase, and preferred to be called a social chemist, not a bartender.

Steve is the quintessential gentleman, erudite and gracious. His humility underscores the fact he is simplistically, as he's said, not a man of many words, but he speaks the language of good food and wine.

To say Cavey's will be missed after it closes on May 24th, is an understatement. We wish Steve, Kate, and the entire Cavey's family well wishes as they start this new chapter and thank them for being the hearth where the community could gather and know there was always good food, good wine, and good fellowship.

# RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JOEL JEAN COURREGES, SR.

## HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Joel Jean Courreges, Sr., a decorated veteran and Kitsap County community member, who passed away on May 10, 2019.

Joel was born in France on March 15, 1950. He attended Roosevelt High School in Seattle and immediately enlisted in the Marines after graduation. Through his decorated career of military service, Joel attained the rank of Sergeant and served two tours as a mortarman in Phu Bai and Danang, where he was wounded. Returning home from Vietnam, he married Kandace K. Hove and had two children, Joel Jr. and Danielle. In 1973, he met his current wife, Carol, and they were married, expanding his family to include Deanna and Tami.

After his time in the military, Joel continued to seek ways to serve his community and contribute to its growth and vitality. He spent thirty-six years as a truck operator before retiring in 2006. Not long after his retirement, Joel became a service officer for the Bremerton chapter of Disabled American Veterans, eventually taking on the role of Commander.

Through his work with Disabled American Veterans, Joel served his community diligently by outreaching, connecting, and supporting veterans across Kitsap County. His work earned praise and numerous accolades during his tenure, including a Golden Tennis Shoe award from Senator PATTY MURRAY.

In addition to his work with Disabled American Veterans, Joel also served on the Kitsap County Veterans Advisory Board, helping shape the County's efforts in supporting its many veterans who call our region home.

Madam Speaker, Joel set an example for all of us who strive to serve and better our communities. Even in the face of increasing health hardship, Joel maintained a steadfast commitment to working on behalf of veterans and we are better off because of his great work.

I am honored to recognize Joel Jean Courreges, Sr.'s great life and legacy of service and send my very best to his family, friends, and the staff of the Bremerton chapter of Disabled American Veterans.

CONGRATULATING THE JOHNSON  
FAMILY ON RECEIVING THE  
LEOPOLD CONSERVATION  
AWARD

### HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, today I rise to highlight the Johnson farm in Frankfort, South Dakota as the recent recipients of the state's Leopold Conservation Award.

Alan and Mickie Johnson, with their son Brian and his wife Jamie, farm 1,800 acres of cropland and 500 acres of grassland in Spink County.

Using various techniques and technologies, the Johnsons intend to leave the landscape in better shape than they received it. Working with Natural Resource Conservation Service, they have incorporated no-till farming practices and switched to a variable rate fertilizer system.

Using farm bill programs such as EQIP, CRP and CSP, the Johnson family has demonstrated that you can do the right thing for the environment while remaining productive and economical.

As this body debates solutions to environmental challenges, we should reflect on the accomplishments of those hard-working individuals who achieve conservation on the ground.

I commend the Johnson Family on their achievement as stewards of the land as they raise nutritious food that many of us take for granted every day.

### RECOGNIZING STOP THE BLEED DAY

### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize today as Stop the Bleed Day. For four years, the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma has been leading the way on training folks in our communities about how to safely stop traumatic bleeding.

I was honored to host a Stop the Bleed training here on Capitol Hill where we trained almost 100 people on how to save the lives of others and themselves. Because of this training, these folks are equipped and empowered to assist someone before a trained medical professional can take over.

Whether as a result of a gunshot, traffic accident, or other injury, traumatic bleeding can be life threatening. Like with CPR training, the hope is that the training will never be put into use. However, should a tragedy occur, those who have taken the Stop the Bleed training just might save a life.

I hope all of my colleagues here today will join me in recognizing Stop the Bleed Day, commending the American College of Surgeons, and think about hosting training sessions in their communities.

IN MEMORY OF RONNIE YOUNG

### HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Ronnie Young was a model public servant who genuinely loved the people he represented. I was fortunate to work with him firsthand as Chairman of the Aiken County Council, where he uniquely ran countywide fairly serving every community. Each year as County Council Chairman and later, State House member, one of my highlights in public service was to be a guest of Ronnie in Christmas parades where he never had a shortage of candy to share. You could see the mutual love and affection between him and his constituents. Roxanne and I would like to extend our deepest sympathy to his wife Susan, family, and innumerable friends.

CLEARWATER, SC—Funeral Services for Mr. Ronald "Ronnie" Young, 71, of Clearwater, SC, who entered into rest May 19, 2019, will be conducted Friday morning at 11 o'clock from the Christian Heritage Congregational Holiness Church. Bishop Phillip Napier and Pastor Stephen Phillips officiating.

Mr. Young was a native of Aiken County, having made the Valley Community his lifelong residence. He was a member of the Sweetwater Church of God, attended Leavelle McCampbell School and graduated from Langley-Bath-Clearwater High School and was a former HR Manager with the Graniteville Company. Mr. Young enjoyed a long career of public service including the following responsibilities, currently a Full-time Legislator as a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives for District 84 serving on the Education and Public Works Committee and the Rules Committee; a member of the Aiken County Council, Valley Public Authority, Aiken County School Board, Three Rivers Solid Waste Authority, Three Rivers Solid Waste Technology Center, U.S. Selective Service Board and the Lower Savannah River Council of Governments. He was a member of several civic and governmental organizations including the Graniteville Exchange Club, Aiken Rotary Club, Midland Valley Lion's Club, Midland Valley Chamber of Commerce, the Has Been Club and the South Carolina Association of Counties. All whom he befriended enjoyed his well-known culinary skills.

Survivors include his wife of 48 years, Susan Napier Young; a sister, Patricia Boyd, Warrenton; two brothers-in-law, Paul (Lucy) Felberg, North Augusta and Bishop Phillip (Sonya) Napier, Modoc; a sister-in-law, Mary Young, Graniteville; several nieces and nephews. Mr. Young was predeceased by a daughter, Tabatha Young, parents, Norris and Earlene Renew Young and a brother, Terry Young.

Honorary Pallbearers will be members of the South Carolina General Assembly and the Has Been Club. Active Pallbearers will be Joel Randall, John Caleb Napier, Leighton McLendon, Tommy McElveen, Roger Boyd, Bubba Baker and Ray Taylor.

The family will receive friends at the Christian Heritage Congregational Holiness Church Thursday evening from 6 until 8.

The family expresses deep appreciation to Tommy McElveen and Joel Randall for their loving care of Mr. Young.

RECOGNIZING MR. MICHAEL S.  
MONAGHAN

### HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Michael S. Monaghan in honor of his retirement as executive director of the Illinois Community College Trustees Association. Mr. Monaghan has been a crucial member in the education community for over 45 years, spearheading the movement to reform the community college system in Illinois while transforming thousands of lives along the way.

As a leader, teacher, and mentor, Mr. Monaghan has been an instrumental part of enhancing the educational experiences of young adults and professors across the state of Illinois. While serving as director of the Community College Trustees Association, he was able to successfully establish a state health insurance program for community college retirees, providing crucial benefits to countless employees.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Mr. Michael S. Monaghan and commend him for his impeccable work for the people of Illinois. I wish him the best in his retirement.

CONGRATULATING LEADERSHIP  
ARKANSAS' XIII GRADUATING  
CLASS

### HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I extend my sincere congratulations to a new crop of emerging leaders from the Natural State.

Leadership Arkansas is a unique program grounded in the belief that real progress is achieved by bringing a diverse set of interests and backgrounds together. First introduced in 2005 by the Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce and Associated Industries of Arkansas, Leadership Arkansas recruits highly-motivated individuals to experience first-hand the dynamic interactions between cities, industries, governmental units and the people they serve.

The fifty-eight members of Leadership Arkansas' XIII graduating class are all respected and committed leaders within their communities and professions.

This year's graduating class includes: Ashten Adamston, Dina Bates, Dan Beranek, Len Blaylock III, Darrell Boggs, Jordan Burgess, Col. Thomas Crimmins, Chip Culpepper, Hollie Cummings, Kerrie Diaz, Chase Dugger, Bailey Faulkner, Rebekah Fincher, William Fletcher, Kristin Kirk, Pody Gay, Lisa Gazaway, Katherine Gentry, Anna Beth Gorman, Chris Gosnell, Michael Goswami, Adrienne Griffiths, Jordan Hale, Burt Hicks, Michael Hoggard, Kendra Jones, David Kelley, Kelsey Kelton, Chris Knollmeyer, Victoria Lamb, Laura Landreaux, Sarah Lane, Margot Lemaster, Gregg Long, Jason McGehee, Jim McGill, Vanessa Moody, Jaime G. Moss, Bob Mouser, Keegan Nichols, Jason Orlicek, Meredith Pettigrew, Mindy Pipkin, Dawn Prasifka, Gregg Ratliff, Matt Rickford, Jeanne Roepcke, Reggie Rose, Payton Smith, Bill Solleder,

Luke Story, Nacole Sweeney, Hilary Trudell, Kevin Weldon, Lawren Wilcox, Temeka Williams, Emily Wood, and Amiee York.

These individuals have worked diligently over the past nine months to enhance the economic outlook of our great state.

They join the dynamic group of Leadership Arkansas' alumni, more than 600 strong, who have gone on to accept roles of great responsibility in the private and public sectors. I congratulate them on their achievement and am excited to see how they shape the future of the state of Arkansas and our great country.

#### GI BILL ACCESS TO CAREER CREDENTIALS ACT

### HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the GI Bill Access to Career Credentials Act, which would allow Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) educational assistance to cover the cost of approved preparatory courses for professional license and certification exams. By covering these courses under the GI Bill, veterans and their eligible family members will have better access to the support they need to enter in-demand careers in health care, teaching, technology and other fields that may require government licenses and certifications. To ensure quality and accountability, courses eligible for reimbursement must be approved beforehand by their State Approving Agency based on current requirements in law.

For the past 75 years, the VA estimates the GI Bill has helped more than 25 million veterans and their families nationwide including the Marianas achieve their educational and career goals. During this time, Congress expanded the GI Bill to cover non-tuition expenses such as college admissions test fees, admissions test preparatory courses and exam fees for licenses and certifications. While the more than 5,700 GI Bill students across the country over the last year and half used their license and certification exam fees reimbursement benefit according to the VA, courses designed to help them pass these tests, such as a \$400 nurse licensing exam course offered by Northern Marianas College, are not reimbursable. Not all students pass these exams on their first attempt which is why the GI Bill must be updated so VA educational assistance covers both preparatory courses and reimbursement of test fees for licenses and certifications.

Around 20 to 30 percent of graduating seniors each year enter the military according to the Marianas Public School System. When these future veterans transition to civilian life, the GI Bill benefits they earned should help prepare them to succeed in an economy increasingly reliant on technical skills which often requires paying for various tests, professional licenses, and other credentials. The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BANKS, is an original cosponsor of the bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, endorsed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which will help veterans and their eligible family members access the necessary credentials

to make their educational and career dreams a reality.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, on May 17, 2019 I was unable to vote due to my daughter's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 215; YEA on Roll Call No. 216; and NAY on Roll Call No. 217.

#### RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF TERRY NORWOOD

### HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Terry Norwood from the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation (MFBF).

Mr. Norwood, a native of Union County, Mississippi, was born on December 27, 1951. He was raised on a dairy and cotton farm in Rockyford, Mississippi now known as Etta, Mississippi. It was here that Mr. Norwood's love for agriculture sparked. In 1969, Mr. Norwood graduated from West Union High School and attended Northeast Mississippi Junior College. After his two years at Northeast, Mr. Norwood earned his Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Education and Agriculture Engineering from Mississippi State University. Mr. Norwood subsequently earned a Masters Degree in Agriculture and Extension Education.

On June 1, 1993, Mr. Norwood joined the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation as a Fieldman and Regional Manager. He remained faithful in his commitment to MFBF for 26 years. Under his leadership, there has been 5 Achievement Award winners, 5 Discussion Meet winners, 2 Excellent in Ag winners, and 3 Farm Women of the Year winners. Leadership is often measured by what that individual achieves but a true leader is measured by what his subordinates achieve. The amount of awards people received under his leadership speaks volumes of the man and leader Mr. Norwood is.

In March of 1977, Mr. Norwood married his better half, Debbie McNabb Norwood and have spent 43 years happily married. Together they have three kids, Franklin, Dr. Allison, and Jacob. Mr. and Mrs. Norwood own and operate Rockyford Farms and Rockford Sorghum Mill, where they have produced sweet sorghum syrup called "Moonlite Gold" for 39 years with no intentions of stopping anytime soon.

Mr. Norwood has selflessly served his community and state for years, and I wish him and his family many years of health and happiness.

#### REMEMBERING FATHER ANGELO CASERTA

### HON. WARREN DAVIDSON

OF OHIO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great man. Born in Piqua, Ohio, Father Angelo Caserta, was the oldest active priest in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. He peacefully passed away last week.

Those who knew Father Caserta recall his talent for people, his comforting words, and his love for our community.

When asked about the secret to his longevity, Father Caserta said, "My secret is the good Lord. The Lord gets all the credit. I'm the only classmate surviving in my class. Not many average that milestone. It's a celebration of God's goodness. How He could choose someone like me and take care of me for 70 years while doing His work in the priesthood."

While I did not know Father Caserta personally, I know of his deeds by those who did, and the love he had for our community.

Madam Speaker, I honor Father Caserta's life of service, and extend my condolences to those who knew him.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF TWO RIVER THEATER AND JOAN AND ROBERT RECHNITZ

### HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Two River Theater on its 25th Anniversary and join its leadership, staff and Board of Trustees in honoring its founders, Joan and Robert Rechnitz.

Founded in 1994 by Joan and Robert (Bob) Rechnitz, Two River Theater continues to bring art, culture and vitality to the greater Red Bank community. Two River Theater is a premier regional theater, providing an outstanding educational and recreational resource for the greater Monmouth County area. Its efforts to introduce theater to a broader audience and represent the diversity of the communities it serves are commendable. Two River Theater remains dedicated to fostering new work and imaginative interpretations of classics, supporting the creative expressions of many leading artists. Its commitment to promoting the arts has contributed to the thriving cultural landscape of the community.

Joan and Bob's commitment to the arts and humanities extends beyond Two River Theater. The Joan and Robert Rechnitz Hall at Monmouth University promotes arts exhibitions and education and Bob continues to serve on the Board of Trustees of the Philadelphia Orchestra, among many other philanthropic endeavors. In addition to promoting arts appreciation and advancement, Joan and Bob are stalwart advocates of land preservation and conservation efforts as well as health care facilities and innovations, supporting the Monmouth Conservation Foundation, Monmouth Medical Center, Riverview Medical Center and many others. Their impact on the community is immeasurable.

Once again, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing the contributions and achievements of Joan and Robert Rehnitz and congratulating Two River Theater on its 25th Anniversary. The theater enriches the quality of life of Monmouth County and brings new visitors and artistic diversity to the community.

IN MEMORY OF MICHAEL  
KOSKOFF, ESQUIRE

**HON. JOE COURTNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and deeds of Michael Koskoff, Esquire, a champion for civil and criminal justice who passed away on April 24, 2019. Michael resided in the state of Connecticut, where his law practice achieved the highest level of success for his clients in courtrooms all across America, because his intelligence, creativity, and high ethical and moral standards.

Michael was a unique attorney. His family has been part of the trial bar over multiple generations, but also he was the scion of a family of stage performers. Some were actors, singers and musicians. His father, Theodore, was both his law partner and an accomplished cellist. "We're show people," Michael once explained. He won record settlements in Connecticut negligence and malpractice cases by coupling skills he had acquired in training to be a Shakespearean actor with a lifelong antagonism toward corporate greed. He also pioneered the use of vivid courtroom videos delivered in a documentary format.

For example, in 1979, Mr. Koskoff persuaded a jury in Danbury, CT, to award his client \$1.8 million in a wrongful-death case—Connecticut's first verdict of more than \$1 million in such a suit. In 1999, jurors awarded \$27 million for what he had demonstrated was a bungled heart operation at Yale-New Haven Hospital, which left a 29-year-old man permanently blind and brain-damaged. At the time, it was the biggest personal injury verdict in the state's history. In a medical malpractice case that became the subject of a book, *Damages: One Family's Legal Struggles in the World of Medicine* by Barry Werth, a couple represented by Mr. Koskoff settled for \$6.25 million in the early 1990s nine years after their baby, who had severe cerebral palsy and developmental disabilities, was born at Norwalk Hospital in Connecticut. (The child's twin brother had been stillborn there). In his book, Mr. Werth described Mr. Koskoff's courtroom techniques as "raw theater." "Koskoff liked to depend on his own 'visceral and instinctive reality' of what was happening in a courtroom—was a witness nervous? arrogant? appealing? unappealing?—to decide how best to keep the drama fresh," Mr. Werth wrote. "He also liked to keep the other side's experts off balance by not letting them know what to expect of him. If he met them, he might like them, and that would dull his attack."

Madam Speaker, in addition to his successful practice, Michael had a rich family life. He married Rosalind Jacobs in 1963 and had four children—two daughters, Sarah Koskoff, an actress and screen writer, Juliet Koskoff a law-

yer in New York, and two sons Jacob Koskoff a screenwriter who collaborated with his father on the feature film "Marshall," a rendering of a criminal trial Justice Thurgood Marshall handled as an attorney in 1941. His other son, Joshua, is a partner in Michael's firm who just last month prevailed in a groundbreaking case against the gun manufacturer Remington Arms—a case that was brought by the families of the victims of the 2012 Sandy Hook school shooting.

Madam Speaker, Michael Koskoff brought to life the promise of American ideals of fairness and justice for "the little guy." With all of his success though, he never "put on airs" with people he met. He was generous with his time and support for his colleagues in the legal profession, the arts, and political causes devoted to a better community and nation. His presence will be sorely missed by those who had the privilege to know him, including myself. However, it is safe to say his memory will never be forgotten.

I would ask the House to please join me in extending deepest condolences to Michael's wife Rosalind and his family for their loss.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE GORDON HELSEL'S RETIREMENT FROM THE VIRGINIA HOUSE OF DELEGATES

**HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of The Honorable Gordon Helsel's retirement from the Virginia House of Delegates. His extensive history as a military serviceman and a public servant exemplify his selflessness and dedication to our great nation.

In 1967, Gordon Helsel was drafted into the United States Army and was deployed to Vietnam as an infantry soldier. Ten months into his tour of duty, Gordon was ambushed by North Vietnamese soldiers and sustained multiple injuries while returning fire on the enemy position. Gordon's injuries would require him to spend five months in recovery and rightfully earned him two Purple Hearts and the Bronze Star. Gordon has been a steadfast advocate for veterans and a tireless supporter of our active duty military members and families. The Vietnam veterans' community has benefitted tremendously from Gordon's efforts and advocacy and has an unshakable bond with him and his family.

Since his military service, Gordon has pursued his dream of owning a business, purchasing the York Box and Barrel Manufacturing Company, Inc., which supplies containers for the region's seafood industry. He has helped many a seafood dealer and waterman throughout Tidewater Virginia. Anyone in the seafood processing or harvesting business has come across Gordon and his fantastic products. Consumers of seafood also greatly appreciate the preservation of quality that his products have provided to seafood lovers.

His service would continue at the local level where he served as city council member, Vice Mayor, Mayor, and Chief of Poquoson's Volunteer Fire Company. Gordon would eventually be elected to the House of Delegates in

2011, representing the 91st House District of Virginia. His efforts in serving his community on many levels has placed him as the quintessential servant leader in the eyes of folks through Virginia. His love of his country, Commonwealth and community shines through in everything that he says and does. His community loves Gordon and he loves them back.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognition of Delegate Helsel's retirement from the Virginia General Assembly. Words alone cannot express our gratitude for his lifelong service to not only his community but to his country as well. May God bless Gordon Helsel and his family as he enters his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. KATIE PORTER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes on Monday, May 20, 2019 due to a delayed flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "YES" on roll call votes 218 and 219.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BILL HUIZENGA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes due to my daughter's graduation from High School. Had I been present for roll call vote number 218, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 1952, the Intercountry Adoption Information Act, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 219, on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and agree on H. Res. 106, Denouncing female genital mutilation/cutting as a violation of the human rights of women and girls and urging the international community and the Federal Government to increase efforts to eliminate the harmful practice, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 220, On Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 389, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1500) Consumers First Act, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act, and providing for proceedings during the period from May 24, 2019, through May 31, 2019, and for other purposes, I would have voted "yea." Had I been present for roll call vote number 221, On Agreeing to the Resolution on H. Res. 389, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1500) Consumers First Act, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act, and providing for proceedings during the period from May 24, 2019, through May 31, 2019, and for other purposes, I would have voted "nay."



HONORING THE LIFE OF JON  
DOUGLAS STEWART

**HON. DOUG COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life of Jon Douglas Stewart.

Doug was born and raised in Chicopee, Georgia, and graduated from Gainesville High School before earning his Bachelor of Arts degree from Emory University. He later graduated from Emory School of Law and was admitted to the State Bar of Georgia in 1962. Doug practiced in both state and federal courts throughout Georgia, and in 1968, he began working at the Gainesville-based law firm, Stewart, Melvin & Frost, where he was a loyal partner for 50 years. As partner and senior litigator, Doug handled litigation ranging from commercial contract disputes to domestic relations cases and everything in between.

Doug was known as a steadfast leader and mentor in our community, serving in many capacities and dedicating his career to teaching and investing in the next generation of lawyers. From 1981 to 1982, Doug served as President of the State Bar of Georgia. He then spent the next decade sitting on the Georgia Bar Foundation's Board of Trustees, serving as both President and Vice President between 1983 and 1993. Towards the end of his tenure as President, Doug was honored with one of the State Bar's highest accolades—the Distinguished service Award—in recognition of his service, professionalism, and integrity. Just last year, Doug was honored with the Thomas O. Marshall Professionalism Award—the State Bar's highest honor.

As an active member of Gainesville First United Methodist Church, Doug took great joy in mentoring young leaders through teaching Sunday school classes and serving as Chairman of the Administrative Board. He lived out his passion for music by singing in the church choir and participating in local theatre and musical productions.

Jon Douglas Stewart leaves behind an honorable legacy of integrity, leadership, and service. He will be greatly missed by many, but he will always be remembered for his incredible impact on countless lives across Hall County and beyond.

RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF MAY  
AS GBS/CIDP AWARENESS

**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of May as GBS/CIDP Awareness Month 2019 and ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the CIDP and MMN communities through cosponsoring the Medicare IVIG Access Enhancement Act.

The bill Act would provide much-needed assistance to Medicare patients suffering from two rare diseases, Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy (CIDP) and Multifocal Motor Neuropathy (MMN). These debilitating conditions are the result of a pa-

tient's own immune system attacking their motor nerves, leading to compromised mobility and reduced quality of life.

Patients are frequently treated with intravenous immune globulin (IVIG), a plasma-derived medicine that can significantly improve health outcomes for these vulnerable patient populations. Given the mobility challenges associated with CIDP and MMN, treatment in the homes is the preferred site of care for many patients.

I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation by becoming a cosponsor. The establishment of a home infusion option for patients with CIDP and MMN will help promote therapy adherence, enhance quality of life and promote positive health outcomes for beneficiaries with CIDP and MMN.

RECOGNIZING WORLD WAR I  
VETERANS FROM COVINGTON, OH

**HON. WARREN DAVIDSON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the contributions and sacrifices of brave World War I soldiers from Covington, Ohio, and its surrounding areas.

These soldiers fought with the U.S. Army's 148th Infantry Regiment, 37th Buckeye Division. In October of 1918, they fought in the muddy fields of Belgium in the great battle of Ypres.

Topping their trenches, the 37th faced a hailstorm of bullets, bombs and poisonous gas. Undeterred, they pressed the attack, penetrating enemy lines. These brave soldiers gained their objective and forced their foe into a headlong retreat. At least nine servicemen from the Covington area were killed or died in military service during the war, including: Orville Bazill, J. Lowell Boyer, Albert B. Cole, Lloyd W. Cornor, Oscar P. Kindell, Edward S. Knight, Arlie Carl Nicholas, Roscoe Rogers, and Fred Siler.

At least fifteen more were wounded, most of whom served with the U.S. Army's 148th Infantry Regiment. Madam Speaker, we must never forget the sacrifices of those who have gone before us. I rise today to honor these brave Ohioans, and to commemorate the newly erected World War I Monument in Highland Cemetery in Covington.

HONORING REX CAFÉ AND  
BAKERY

**HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rex Café & Bakery in McAllen, Texas, and all of its distinguished employees. Rex Café & Bakery was founded by Rogelio Guerrero over 70 years ago in 1947, and I could not be happier to have such a talented group of individuals create jobs in the Rio Grande Valley.

Rogelio was born in Camargo, Tamaulipas, Mexico, on February 3, 1908, and moved to McAllen in 1918. Rogelio was a World War II

Veteran who served as a construction equipment mechanic in the United States Army. Rogelio was awarded the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with Three Bronze Stars and the Philippines Liberation Medal with One Bronze Star as well as many other awards for his service. He was also an active member of the American Legion, served as a member on the advisory board of La Piedad Cemetery, and treasurer of Woodmen of the World.

Rogelio left his legacy to his nephew Baldemar Guerrero, Sr., who in turn left it to his son Baldemar Guerrero, Jr. The Guerrero family's determination and hard work has left a lasting impact on South Texas. Most customers have visited frequently for years to enjoy coffee, baked goods, comfort food, among many others delicious meals and treats. This, along with the top of the line customer service provided by its loyal staff, have made Rex Café & Bakery a pillar of our community.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to represent the hard-working individuals of Rex Café & Bakery and its founder, Rogelio Guerrero. Their success is a shining example of what the 15th District of Texas has to offer.

IN HONOR OF GABE LIPMAN

**HON. JOE COURTNEY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Gabe Lipman of Norwich, Connecticut. For 35 years, Gabe has dedicated herself to the education of our state's children as an art teacher in the Norwich Public School District. Thanks to her, generations of students have learned the value of art in our lives and discovered their own creative talents.

Throughout her professional life Gabe has worked to improve the circumstances of others. While that work was rooted in the classroom, it was by no means confined to it. Empowering her fellow teachers through late-night contract negotiations, serving as a contributing member of the Norwich Arts Center, and volunteering in the community have been a central part of her career. After a lifelong commitment to a single course, it is worth reflecting on the value of this undertaking.

Art and education, taken together, are a virtuous combination that elevate our children. Using this combination with her dynamic and engaging teaching style, Gabe has steadily enlarged the cultural opportunities for her students. Every one of us has had a teacher that has had a profound impact on our life's direction. For all the students who were lucky enough to be in her classroom, Gabe was one of those teachers. The ripples Gabe has cast across the community will never be completely comprehended. But I can assure you this, they are extensive and will continue moving outwards for years and decades to come bringing exuberance and brilliance wherever they land.

Colleagues, I ask you to please join me in extending your gratitude to Ms. Lipman for her commitment to our nation's youth. I thank Gabe for her 35 years of service, and wish her best of luck in the next endeavor.

IN RECOGNITION OF LIBERTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

**HON. RICHARD E. NEAL**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and congratulate Liberty Elementary School in Springfield, Massachusetts on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. This milestone is a testament to the school's faculty, staff, and students who have not only undoubtedly shaped the community of Springfield and beyond for decades, but continue to do so every day.

Liberty Elementary School first opened its doors to young students in Springfield in November 1918. It has now been nearly a full century since that day, and the city has been better for it ever since. For generations, Liberty School's teachers and administrators have dedicated themselves to the education of near countless children. These young individuals have of course gone on to great things in their own right. As a former history teacher in Springfield myself, and current lecturer at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, I know firsthand the value of a good education. Our country's next leaders, thinkers, movers and shakers depend on it. As the great Benjamin Franklin once said, "An investment in knowledge pays the best interest." Liberty Elementary School certainly exemplifies this wisdom. The school's multifaceted curriculum and passion for learning sets students up for future success in college, in their careers, and in their life.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I would like to offer my sincere well-wishes to the Liberty Elementary School community as they celebrate 100 years since the school first opened. Liberty School has truly been essential to the fabric of Springfield for generations and will be for generations to come.

IN HONOR OF PENNY CHAUVETTE

**HON. CHRIS PAPPAS**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 22, 2019*

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penny Chauvette, who is being honored as the Greater Manchester/Nashua Board of Realtors (GMNBR) Realtor of the Year for 2019. A valued member of GMNBR for 31 years, Penny has served her community with distinction, treating both her colleagues and clients with the utmost respect, professionalism, and positivity.

The Greater Manchester/Nashua Board of Realtors (GMNBR) is a local not-for-profit organization dedicated to promoting excellence in the real estate profession by supporting its members through education, community involvement, civic duty, pride of professionalism and advocacy. Over the past 31 years, she has been instrumental in helping the board achieve its critical goal. She has served as a leader at the Board in several ways, sitting on the Budget and Finance Committee and serving as the Chair of the Education Committee. During 2018 alone, Penny made sure that her Committee provided over 46 free continuing education credits for the GMNBR membership. She takes immense pride in serving her community with dignity and respect while inspiring others to do the same. Penny is proud to always wear her realtor pin and highlight her most valuable characteristic: her unwavering and steadfast commitment to ethical behavior.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I want to thank Penny for her decades of dedication to our community. I congratulate her again on this well-deserved honor, and I thank her for all that she does to make our state such a wonderful place to learn, live, and grow.

**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, May 23, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

**MEETINGS SCHEDULED**

**MAY 24**

9:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing with the House Committee on Financial Services on trade-based money laundering.

RHOB-2360

**MAY 29**

9 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing with the House Committee on Financial Services on curbing corruption through corporate transparency and collaboration, focusing on the British model.

RHOB-2128

# Daily Digest

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages S3017–S3064*

**Measures Introduced:** Forty-two bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1585–1626, and S. Res. 218. **Pages S3058–60**

#### Measures Reported:

S. 1321, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

S. 1328, to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens.

S. 1589, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. **Page S3057**

**Nominations Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 123), Howard C. Nielson, Jr., of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah.

**Pages S3019–38, S3064**

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 124), Stephen R. Clark, Sr., of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

**Pages S3038, S3064**

By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 125), Carl J. Nichols, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

**Pages S3038–39, S3064**

By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 126), Kenneth D. Bell, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

**Pages S3039–41, S3064**

**Messages from the House:** **Page S3053**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S3053–54**

**Petitions and Memorials:** **Pages S3054–57**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Pages S3057–58**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S3060–62**

#### Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

**Pages S3062–64**

#### Additional Statements:

**Pages S3051–53**

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** **Page S3064**

**Record Votes:** Four record votes were taken today. (Total—126) **Pages S3038–39**

**Recess:** Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and recessed at 7:12 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 23, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3041.)

### Committee Meetings

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

#### APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from David Bernhardt, Secretary of the Interior.

#### APPROPRIATIONS: MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a closed hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Missile Defense Agency, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Samuel A. Greaves, Director, Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense.

#### AUTHORIZATION: DEFENSE

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020".

#### PFAS RISKS

*Committee on Environment and Public Works:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine legislation to address the risks associated with per- and

polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), after receiving testimony from Lisa Daniels, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Safe Drinking Water, Harrisburg, on behalf of the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators; and Kimberly W. White, American Chemistry Council, Scott Faber, Environmental Working Group, and G. Tracy Mehan, III, American Water Works Association, all of Washington, D.C.

### RECONCILIATION PROCESS IN AFGHANISTAN

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded a closed hearing to examine the reconciliation process in Afghanistan, after receiving testimony from Zalmay Khalilzad, Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation, Department of State.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 178, to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 249, to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1025, to provide humanitarian relief to the Venezuelan people and Venezuelan migrants, to advance a constitutional and democratic solution to Venezuela's political crisis, to address Venezuela's economic reconstruction, to combat public corruption, narcotics trafficking, and money laundering, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1340, to authorize activities to combat the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 31, to require certain additional actions in connection with the national emergency with respect to Syria, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 74, marking the fifth anniversary of Ukraine's Revolution of Dignity by honoring the bravery, determination, and sacrifice of the people of Ukraine during and since the Revolution, and condemning continued Russian aggression against Ukraine, with an amendment;

S. Res. 81, calling for accountability and justice for the assassination of Boris Nemtsov, with amendments;

S. Res. 135, expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and valor by the members of the United States Armed

Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending those individuals for leadership and bravery in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II, with an amendment;

S. Res. 184, condemning the Easter Sunday terrorist attacks in Sri Lanka, offering sincere condolences to the victims, to their families and friends, and to the people and nation of Sri Lanka, and expressing solidarity and support for Sri Lanka, with amendments;

S. Res. 188, encouraging a swift transfer of power by the military to a civilian-led political authority in the Republic of the Sudan, with amendments; and

The nominations of Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador, Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic, Kenneth A. Howery, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Sweden, Matthew S. Klimow, of New York, to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan, and John Jefferson Daigle, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cabo Verde, all of Department of State, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

### NOMINATIONS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Michael S. Bogren, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, who was introduced by Senator Peters, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Jason K. Pulliam, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Frank William Volk, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of West Virginia, who was introduced by Senators Manchin and Capito, and David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, who was introduced by Senator McConnell, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

### SBA OFFICE OF ADVOCACY REAUTHORIZATION

*Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:* Committee concluded a joint hearing with the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy, including S. 78, to ensure a complete analysis of the potential impacts of rules on small entities, S. 83, to amend section 203 of Public Law 94-305 to ensure

proper authority for the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, S. 1120, to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Regulatory Flexibility Act”), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, S. 1339, to require greater transparency for Federal regulatory decisions that impact small businesses, S. 1420, to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of major rules in accomplishing their regulatory objectives by promoting retrospective review, S. 1419, to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules, S. 1409, to enhance the ability of the Office of the National Ombudsman to assist small businesses in meeting regulatory requirements and develop outreach initiatives to promote awareness of the services the Office of the National Ombudsman provides, after receiving testimony from Major L. Clark, III, Acting Chief Counsel, Office of Advocacy, Small Business Administration; Winslow Sargeant, International Council for Small Business, Great Falls, Virginia; John Arensmeyer, Small Business Majority, Washington D.C.; Jeanette Hernandez Prenger, ECCO Select, Kansas City, Missouri, on behalf of Women Impacting Public Policy; and Rick Baumann, Murrells Inlet Seafood, Murrells Inlet, South Carolina.

#### VETERANS’ AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

*Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 123, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care, S. 221, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, S. 318, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, S. 450, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to expedite the onboarding process for new medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to reduce the duration of the hiring process for such medical providers, S. 514, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, S. 524, to estab-

lish the Department of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Tribal and Indian Affairs, S. 711, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, S. 746, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the accessibility of websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs to individuals with disabilities, S. 785, to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 805, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, S. 850, to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans, S. 857, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, S. 980, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, S. 1101, to ensure that only licensed health care providers furnish disability examinations under a certain Department of Veterans Affairs pilot program for use of contract physicians for disability examinations, S. 1154, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an advisory committee on the implementation by the Department of Veterans Affairs of an electronic health record, an original bill entitled, “Janey Ensminger Act of 2019”, and an original bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue to pay educational assistance or subsistence allowances to eligible persons when educational institutions are temporarily closed, after receiving testimony from Teresa Boyd, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health, and David Carroll, Executive Director, Mental Health and Suicide Prevention, both of the Veterans Health Administration, and Beth Murphy, Executive Director, Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and Melissa Bryant, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Michael C. Richardson, Wounded Warrior Project, Greg Nebhard, The American Legion, and Major General Jeffrey E. Phillips, USA (Ret.), Reserve Officers Association, all of Washington, D.C.

## AGING AND DISABILITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

*Special Committee on Aging:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine aging and disability in the 21st century, focusing on how technology can help maintain health and quality of life, after receiving testi-

mony from Cara McCarty, Director of Curatorial, Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum; Joseph F. Coughlin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology AgeLab, Cambridge; Brenda Gallant, Maine Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program, Augusta; and Robert A. Mecca, Life and Independence for Today, St. Mary's, Pennsylvania.

# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 50 public bills, H.R. 2888–2937; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 41–43; and H. Res. 394–399, were introduced. **Pages H4117–19**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H4121–22**

**Reports Filed:** There were no reports filed today.

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative DeSaulnier to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4069**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 10:38 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4073**

**Guest Chaplain:** The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. William Johnson, Immanuel United Church of Christ, Ellinwood, Kansas. **Page H4073**

**Consumers First Act:** The House passed H.R. 1500, to require the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to meet its statutory purpose, by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 91 noes, Roll No. 228. **Pages H4075–H4110**

Rejected the Steil motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 227. **Pages H4108–10**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–15 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill. **Page H4082**

Agreed to:

Velázquez amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that reinstitutes Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 reporting requirements and prevents further action by the CFPB without congressional approval; **Pages H4086–87**

Adams amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that reestablishes an interagency memorandum of understanding between the CFPB and the Department of Education concerning the sharing of student borrower complaints to allow for cooperative supervision and oversight of student loan servicers; **Pages H4088–90**

Lawson (FL) amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that adds a monthly reporting requirement that CFPB provide Congress with the number of investigations opened and closed relating to potential fair lending violations, how many fair lending enforcement actions taken or referred, analysis of consumer complaints relating to potential fair lending violations, and stats on how many Office of Fair Lending and Equal Opportunity staff are dedicated to supervision and enforcement; **Pages H4090–91**

Pressley amendment (No. 5 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that requires the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to issue a quarterly report on debt collection complaints and enforcement actions; **Pages H4091–92**

Cohen amendment (No. 8 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that directs the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to require consumer reporting agencies to disclose free credit scores, if requested; also directs the CFPB to develop regulations establishing a mandatory consistent format and to determine if agencies should disclose any other consumer information appropriate with respect to consumer financial education; **Pages H4094–96**

Bonamici amendment (No. 9 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that requires the Assistant Director and Student Loan Ombudsman to issue an annual report to Congress on risks to young consumers and student borrowers; **Pages H4096–97**

Case amendment (No. 10 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that adds expertise in consumer privacy to the membership of the Consumer Advisory Board; **Pages H4097–98**

Golden amendment (No. 11 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that adds representatives of service



members, veterans, and their families to the list of individuals who qualify for appointment to the Consumer Advisory Board; **Pages H4098–99**

Escobar amendment (No. 12 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that directs CFPB to seek to appoint representatives of military- and veteran-serving financial institutions in Advisory Committees; **Page H4099**

Neguse amendment (No. 13 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that requires the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to issue an annual report to Congress of consumer complaints from older Americans, including a state-by-state breakdown of complaints by type of consumer financial product or service and any legislative or regulatory recommendations by the Director; **Pages H4099–H4100**

DeSaulnier amendment (No. 15 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that requires the Bureau to collect additional data from student loan servicers to provide a comprehensive view of loan portfolio performance, and to include findings from this information in the annual Ombudsman report; **Pages H4101–02**

Tlaib amendment (No. 16 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that adds a quarterly reporting requirement that CFPB provide Congress with the number of investigations opened and closed relating to payday/car-title lenders, how many enforcement actions taken, an estimate of how much in fees payday/car-title customers paid, how many times in the previous 12 months a payday customer rolled over their loan, and how many car title loan borrowers lost their car in the previous 12 months; **Pages H4102–03**

Stevens amendment (No. 14 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that ensures that the Consumer Advisory Board is comprised of individuals who represent community banks, credit unions, small business owners, or economic growth experts (by a recorded vote of 418 ayes to 10 noes, Roll No. 225); and **Pages H4100–01, H4107**

Green (TX) amendment (No. 17 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that reinstates the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's final rule governing forced arbitration, within 60 days of enactment (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 226). **Pages H4103–04, H4107–08**

Rejected:

Steil amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that sought to strike the findings in the bill and inserts language requiring the Comptroller General to conduct a study of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) in meeting its statutorily mandated obligations, the prevalence of discriminatory

practices in lending, and the workplace rights of CFPB staff (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 222); **Pages H4087–88, H4104–05**

Burgess amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that sought to strike the section requiring all consumer complaints to be made available to the public on a CFPB website (by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 223); and **Pages H4092–93, H4105–06**

Burgess amendment (No. 7 printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–79) that sought to permanently subject funding for the CFPB to Congressional appropriation and authorizes for FY2020 an amount equal to the aggregate amount of funds transferred by the Board of Governors to the CFPB during FY2019 (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 224). **Pages H4093–94, H4106–07**

H. Res. 389, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1500) and (H.R. 1994) was agreed to yesterday, May 21st.

**Authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I:** The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to S. Con. Res. 14, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I. **Page H4110**

**Authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush:** The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to S. Con. Res. 6, authorizing the printing of a commemorative document in memory of the late President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush. **Pages H4110–11**

**Meeting Hour:** Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, May 23rd. **Page H4111**

**Senate Message:** Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4075.

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Seven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4104–05, H4105–06, H4106–07, H4107, H4108, H4109–10, and H4110. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Full Committee held a markup on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020; and the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020; and the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020 were ordered reported, as amended.

### KEY DESIGN COMPONENTS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR ESTABLISHING A SINGLE-PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

*Committee on the Budget:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Key Design Components and Considerations for Establishing a Single-Payer Health Care System”. Testimony was heard from the following Congressional Budget Office officials: Mark Hadley, Deputy Director; Jessica Banthin, Deputy Assistant Director for Health, Retirement, and Long-Term Analysis; and Jeffrey Kling, Associate Director for Economic Analysis.

### ENGINES OF ECONOMIC MOBILITY: THE CRITICAL ROLE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES, HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, AND MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS IN PREPARING STUDENTS FOR SUCCESS

*Committee on Education and Labor:* Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment held a hearing entitled “Engines of Economic Mobility: The Critical Role of Community Colleges, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Minority-Serving Institutions in Preparing Students for Success”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### LIFT AMERICA: MODERNIZING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE FUTURE

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “LIFT America: Modernizing Our Infrastructure for the Future”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### THE ANNUAL TESTIMONY OF THE TREASURY ON THE STATE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM, PART II

*Committee on Financial Services:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Annual Testimony of the Treasury on the State of the International Financial System, Part II”. Testimony was heard from Steven T. Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

### SEARCHING FOR SOLUTIONS IN SYRIA: THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S STRATEGY

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Searching for Solutions in Syria: The Trump Administration's Strategy”. Testimony was heard from James F. Jeffrey, Special Representative for Syria Engagement and Special Envoy to the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, Department of State.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2615, the “United States-Northern Triangle Enhanced Engagement Act”; H.R. 2744, the “USAID Branding Modernization Act”; H.R. 598, the “Georgia Support Act”; H.R. 2140, the “Preventing Child Marriage Act”; H.R. 2023, the “Protect European Energy Security Act”; H.R. 2046, the “Energy Diplomacy Act”; H. Res. 129, condemning the Government of Saudi Arabia's continued detention and alleged abuse of women's rights activists; H. Res. 372, expressing concern for the United States-Turkey alliance; H. Res. 345, recognizing widening threats to freedoms of the press and expression around the world, reaffirming the centrality of a free and independent press to the health of democracy, and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority of the United States. H.R. 2615, H.R. 2140, H.R. 2023, H.R. 2046, H. Res. 129, and H. Res. 345 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 2744, H.R. 598, and H. Res. 372 were ordered reported, without amendment.

### A REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

*Committee on Homeland Security:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “A Review of the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security”. Testimony was heard from Kevin K. McAleenan, Acting Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

### MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2820, the “Dream Act of 2019”; H.R. 2821, the “American Promise Act of 2019”; and H.R. 549, the “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”. H.R. 2820, H.R. 2821, and H.R. 549 were ordered reported, as amended.

### LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 182, to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission;

H.R. 307, the “Preserving America’s Battlefields Act”; H.R. 473, to authorize the Every Word We Utter Monument to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; H.R. 1088, the “FIRST Act”; H.R. 1130, the “Fort Pillow National Battlefield Park Study Act”; H.R. 1179, the “African-American Burial Grounds Network Act”; H.R. 1248, the “York River Wild and Scenic River Act of 2019”; H.R. 1472, to rename the Homestead National Monument of America near Beatrice, Nebraska, as the Homestead National Historical Park; H.R. 1487, the “Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Study Act”; H.R. 1727, the “Complete America’s Great Trails Act”; H.R. 2369, the “Long Island Aviation History Act”; H.R. 2427, the “Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Reauthorization Act of 2019”; H.R. 2490, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; H.R. 2525, to establish the Steel Valley National Heritage Area in the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Representatives Ryan, Pingree, Smith of Nebraska, Fortenberry, Connolly, Adams, Sarbanes, Rush, Marshall, Keating, and Neguse; P. Daniel Smith, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

#### **RESPONDING TO THE GLOBAL ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE-POLICY PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES**

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing entitled “Responding to the Global Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

#### **FACIAL RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGY (PART 1): ITS IMPACT ON OUR CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES**

*Committee on Oversight and Reform:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Facial Recognition Technology (Part 1): Its Impact on our Civil Rights and Liberties”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

#### **EXAMINING FOR-PROFIT COLLEGE OVERSIGHT AND STUDENT DEBT**

*Committee on Oversight and Reform:* Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy held a hearing entitled “Examining For-Profit College Oversight and

Student Debt”. Testimony was heard from Christopher Madaio, Assistant Attorney General, Consumer Protection Division, Maryland Office of the Attorney General; and public witnesses.

#### **SECURING U.S. ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROTECTING POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

*Committee on Oversight and Reform:* Subcommittee on National Security Hearing held a hearing entitled “Securing U.S. Election Infrastructure and Protecting Political Discourse”. Testimony was heard from Christopher Krebs, Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Adam Hickey, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, Department of Justice; Christy McCormick, Chairwoman, U.S. Election Assistance Commission; Ellen L. Weintraub, Commissioner, U.S. Federal Election Commission; Bill Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth, Massachusetts; and public witnesses.

#### **IMMIGRATION AND THE SMALL BUSINESS WORKFORCE**

*Committee on Small Business:* Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Immigration and the Small Business Workforce”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

#### **DISASTER PREPAREDNESS: DRRR IMPLEMENTATION AND FEMA READINESS**

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Disaster Preparedness: DRRR Implementation and FEMA Readiness”. Testimony was heard from Daniel Kaniewski, Deputy Administrator for Resilience, Federal Emergency Management Agency; and public witnesses.

#### **MISSION CRITICAL: CARING FOR OUR HEROES**

*Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:* Subcommittee on Health; and Subcommittee on Technology Modernization held a joint hearing entitled “MISSION Critical: Caring for our Heroes”. Testimony was heard from Dr. Steven Lieberman, M.D., Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Elyse Kaplan, Deputy Director, Caregiver Support Program, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Alan Constantian, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Account Management, Office of Information and Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs; Carol C.

Harrism, Director for Information Technology Acquisition Management, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

#### **IMPROVING THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EFFECTIVENESS: RESPONDING TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERSIGHT AGENCIES**

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs:* Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Improving the Department of Veterans Affairs Effectiveness: Responding to Recommendations from Oversight Agencies". Testimony was heard from Gene Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; and Michael Missal, Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

#### **ENFORCEMENT IN THE NEW NAFTA**

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled "Enforcement in the New NAFTA". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### *Joint Meetings*

#### **ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE 2020 CENSUS**

*Joint Economic Committee:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic impacts of the 2020 Census and business uses of Federal data, after receiving testimony from Andrew Reamer, George Washington University Institute of Public Policy, Howard Fienberg, Insights Association, and Nicholas Eberstadt, American Enterprise Institute, all of Washington, D.C.; and Mallory Bateman, University of Utah Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, Salt Lake City.

#### **COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2019**

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

##### **Senate**

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, to hold hearings to examine the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act in action, focusing on the benefits of economic diplomacy, 9:45 a.m., SD-419.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* to hold hearings to examine resources needed to protect and secure the homeland, 9:30 a.m., SD-342.

##### **House**

*Committee on Appropriations,* Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, markup on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, 8:30 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, markup on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, 10 a.m., 2362 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce, hearing entitled "Summer Driving Dangers: Exploring Ways to Protect Drivers and their Families", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Natural Resources,* Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Insular Areas Medicaid Cliff", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,* Full Committee, hearing entitled "Mission Imperative: Diversity and Inclusion in the Intelligence Community", 9:30 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Select Committee on the Climate Crisis,* Full Committee, hearing entitled "Creating a Climate Resilient America", 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

*Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress,* Full Committee, business meeting to consider proposed recommendations on transparency, 9:15 a.m., 2020 Rayburn.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 23

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

9 a.m., Thursday, May 23

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Thursday:** Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

## House Chamber

**Program for Thursday:** Consideration of H.R. 1994—Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act of 2019.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E657  
 Bost, Mike, Ill., E654  
 Case, Ed, Hawaii, E653  
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E657  
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E656, E657  
 Davidson, Warren, Ohio, E655, E657  
 Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E657

Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E651  
 Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E656  
 Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E654  
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E655  
 Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E653  
 Larson, John B., Conn., E653  
 Neal, Richard E., Mass., E658  
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E655  
 Pappas, Chris, N.H., E658

Porter, Katie, Calif., E656  
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E653  
 Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E655  
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E654  
 Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E655  
 Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E654  
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E654  
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E656



# 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](http://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](mailto:contactcenter@gpo.gov). ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://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.