



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2019

No. 19

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 30, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Bless the Members of this assembly as they consider all the options and compromises they might face in the weeks to come.

May the desire to act speedily to implement promises made while campaigning not prevent the careful consideration of all possible outcomes in the governing process. Send Your Spirit of wisdom and discernment upon them in their work.

May Your blessing, O God, be with all our leaders this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a

vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VAN DREW led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE FUTURE OF CONGRESS

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the future of our Congress.

I stand here today at a crossroads: a crossroads of cooperation, a crossroads

of bipartisanship, and a crossroads of accomplishment.

This is a chance to begin to make Americans proud of our Congress once again, certainly more proud than the 13 percent approval rating that we currently have.

Republicans and Democrats can have different opinions. They should have different opinions. But they should never push these opinions to such extremes that we end up hurting our good American people.

In the next 2½ weeks, both sides of the aisle can truly achieve greatness.

Mr. Speaker, we came here not to be great Democrats nor to be great Republicans. We came here to become, and to be, great Americans. I pray to God that we will be.

God bless our great country of America.

RECOGNIZING HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, the world joined together in honoring the memory of those who were murdered during the Holocaust.

In 2005, the United Nations designated January 27 as International Holocaust Remembrance Day.

The systematic, government-sponsored persecution and murder of 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime and its collaborators will always be a scar on humanity.

We promise to always remember those who lost their lives, those who survived, and those who saved them, those who stood in the face of such evil and refused to turn a blind eye. We make this promise to ensure such blight on humanity will never happen again.

□ 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.

H1287

By remembering the events of the Holocaust, we can understand how important it is to defend those who are defenseless. We must eradicate hatred and never become indifferent to the suffering of others.

Mr. Speaker, on the international day of remembrance, the most important thing to reflect upon is the humanity that exists in all of us.

PREVENTING THE NEXT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say I am embarrassed by the past month.

This is my first week in Congress without our government being shut down. I came to Washington to help my community. It is a shame that the benchmark for progress so far has been whether or not the government has even been open. It is hard to lower the bar from there. We can't let this happen again.

Alongside some of my freshman colleagues, I have cosponsored legislation that says, even if the government shuts down, Congress will still have the funding to pay our Federal workers.

And it goes further than that. If Congress fails to make a deal, we should withhold pay from Members of Congress, we should stop using taxpayer dollars for travel, and we should end bonuses for the executive branch.

In other words, if the government shuts down, the people at fault should be held accountable, not the workers. If families in my district can't get their paychecks or if farmers can't get their USDA grants, then elected officials need to feel the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, governing from one crisis to the next is an embarrassment. I came here to do better. We have a chance to turn it around right now.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IS POSSIBLE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as my new Governor just mentioned in her first budget address, in South Dakota, we don't spend money we don't have.

South Dakota has never incurred any general obligation debt, and that doesn't happen by accident. It takes decades of prudent and, sometimes, unpopular decisions. I am proud to be a part of that history.

Now, in Washington, the story is a little different. We haven't always had that same kind of intestinal fortitude, so our debt is \$22 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is plenty of blame to go around, but I am more interested in solutions. Taking our

medicine—and we do need to take our medicine—will not be easy, and we can't do it all at once, but I am ready to take the tough votes. I am hopeful that some of my colleagues are as well.

After all, fiscal responsibility is possible. Just ask South Dakota.

GUN SAFETY

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to gun violence, we talk about Parkland, we talk about Trayvon Martin, and we talk about Jordan Davis. But I want to take a moment today for the victims whom we don't always talk about.

I want to talk about the nearly 100 Americans who lose their lives to gun violence in this country every single day.

I want to talk about the mothers and the fathers who have suffered tragic loss—the voices that we don't always hear.

Just last week, four lost their lives in a shooting just a few miles outside of my district in Georgia. Those four families are torn apart forever.

Each day, nearly 100 families are torn apart forever. For those loved ones, thoughts and prayers are simply not enough. We need policy and we need change. It is on us here in Congress to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that my colleagues here and in the Senate will support me in acting to pass meaningful gun safety legislation

FLOOD INSURANCE FOR FARMERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a bipartisan bill that I have been working on with my colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI). This week, we introduced H.R. 830, the Flood Insurance for Farmers Act.

Currently, FEMA's requirements for flood hazard areas essentially prohibit farmers from expanding or improving operations on what they deem as floodplains, often requiring barns and silos to be raised upwards of 10 feet, which can be very cost prohibitive for farmers and prevent needed buildings. This legislation would remove this unnecessary red tape, while also allowing farmers to pay more reasonable flood insurance rates that align with their true level of risk.

If levees in the area provide a 50-year level of flood protection, FEMA would then charge rates based on that risk level instead of the lack of 100-year flood protection of the existing levee system, which, essentially, means zero availability for flood insurance.

From the north State to the Sacramento Valley and beyond, this legis-

lation is good for agriculture production in California. I urge its passage.

JAMES ISLAND OCEAN ACTKIDVISTS

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share the story of a very remarkable group of children: the James Island Ocean ActKIDvists—Betty, Louis, Makena, and Liam—all between the ages of 6 and 8, who have made it their mission to protect our oceans and our marine life.

Recently, they successfully lobbied the Charleston and James Island City Councils to ban plastic bags, straws, and foam containers, collecting over 300 signatures in support of the ban. At town council meetings, these young activists had the courage to speak up for the marine life that could not speak for itself.

It is our job to preserve the low country's vibrant natural resources for future generations to come. I am proud of the James Island Ocean ActKIDvists for helping lead the way. I thank Betty, Louis, Makena, and Liam.

WASHINGTON IS BROKEN

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand here today as a Representative of New York's 22nd Congressional District.

When I talk to upstate New Yorkers, there is one thing I hear time and time again: that Washington is broken.

We are all tired of Washington's partisanship, and I am here today to reiterate my promise to work with anyone who is willing to solve problems.

I will work with Members of both parties to address skyrocketing healthcare costs and make sure everyone has access to high-quality, affordable care.

I will work to bring good jobs to upstate New York, strengthen our schools, and improve job training programs.

I will fight to make sure our local farmers have the support they need to get a fair price for their goods, succeed financially, and make an honest living.

And I will stand with servicemembers and veterans to ensure they have the support and resources they need when wearing our country's uniform and when they return home.

I will fight for everyday people and take on companies that use power through monopolies to abuse consumers.

Above all else, my top priority will be to listen to my constituents, to be a voice for upstate New Yorkers.

I know that, by working together, we can deliver real results for hard-working people.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 790, FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORKFORCE PAY RAISE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 87 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of February 8, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of

this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 87, providing for consideration of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment, which strikes section 3 of the bill and makes certain other technical corrections to it.

The rule makes in order three amendments. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. Finally, the rule provides suspension authority through the legislative day of February 8, 2019.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 790 will provide for a 2.6 percent pay increase for Federal civilian workers in 2019, beginning with the date of passage, and this brings the civilian pay increase in parity with the automatic adjustment of pay for military servicemembers, which is also 2.6 percent.

The President's fiscal year 2019 budget requested a 2.6 percent increase in basic pay for military servicemembers equivalent to the statutory formula. This increase went into effect on January 1. But on August 30 of last year, President Trump announced that he would issue a downward adjustment of the pay increase for civilian employees because of a national emergency or serious economic conditions affecting the general welfare. He proposed to set the civilian pay increase at zero, no raise.

On December 28 of last year, he followed through on this announcement by signing an executive order overriding the automatic 2.1 percent pay increase civilian workers were set to receive and replacing it with zero. Congress can override and Congress should override this executive order with legislation providing for a pay increase for our hardworking Federal civilian workers. H.R. 790 does just that with a reasonable 2.6 percent increase, matching the increase going into effect for military servicemembers.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any redeeming feature to the sordid chaos of the 35-day government shutdown, the longest in U.S. history, surely, it is that it reminded America that our Federal workforce is indispensable to our commerce, to our economy, to our society, and to our way of life.

We have been reminded that if you take away the air traffic controllers, you take away air travel. If you take away the Transportation Security Ad-

ministration agents, you take away transportation security.

If you take away the Park Service rangers and the Park Service maintenance personnel, you take away our ability to enjoy the national parks free of litter, garbage, backed-up sewage, and criminal activity.

If you take away the food safety inspectors from the FDA and other agencies, you threaten the food supply with E. coli, salmonella, and insect infestation.

If you shut down the EPA, you empower the polluters to foul the air and dirty the waters.

If you shut down the Department of Justice, you throw a monkey wrench into the ability of law enforcement to go after the Mafia, Medicare fraud, white-collar crime, human trafficking, and all of the criminal enterprises endangering public safety.

If you shut down the National Weather Service, you threaten transportation, travel, and public safety.

If you stop paying Customs and Border Protection officers, you weaken border security and you demoralize our Border Patrol.

If you shut down NOAA, you disable America's first responders in the campaign to meet the challenges of climate change.

All of it has an effect on the private sector, too. If you furlough the people writing checks for home mortgages, farm subsidies, State Department personnel, and private contractor payments, you threaten to ruin private contractors, home purchases, small farmers, and small businesses.

If you were to cut off the VA, you would cut off the veterans.

And if you were to pull the plug on the Social Security Administration, you would threaten tens of millions of Americans who depend on Social Security.

The contribution that more than 2.1 million Federal employees make to our country is indispensable; it is incalculable; and it is irreplaceable.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the 35-day self-identified Donald Trump shutdown, the American people not only witnessed the surpassing dedication and patriotism of the Federal workforce, 30 percent of which is made up of veterans, but we were reminded of the critical nature of the work that they do for all of us. They deserve a raise, and we should override President Trump's insulting and embarrassing 2019 pay freeze for the Federal workforce.

To be clear, Federal workers deserved a raise before the shutdown. The Federal Salary Council, an advisory body of the executive branch established to provide recommendations on locality pay, found at the end of last year that, "Federal employee salaries on average lag behind those of the private sector by almost 31 percent," a finding based on U.S. Department of Labor data covering more than 250 different occupational categories.

900,000 Federal workers earn less than \$60,000 a year, and we have seen in the soup kitchens and in the pantries, and the desperate pleas of our constituents for their families, how many Federal workers are just one or two pay-checks away from disaster.

So Federal workers deserved a raise before the shutdown when 800,000 of them were furloughed or compelled to go to work without any pay and they had to take out loans from family members or credit unions just to pay their monthly bills.

They deserved a raise before President Trump imposed the Federal hiring freeze in 2017 and before he froze Federal worker pay in 2019.

They deserved a raise before he tried to cut their health benefits and before he issued three executive orders that would have made it easier to fire Federal workers and destroy their collective bargaining rights, orders that were promptly struck down in Federal court.

But if the Federal workers deserved a raise and needed one before President Trump declared war on the workforce for the American Government, before Steve Bannon defined the goal of the administration as “deconstruction of the administrative state,” before they were derided by the President as Democrats and vilified as the deep state, surely, the economic and moral debacle of the shutdown makes this modest 2.6 percent pay raise a powerful and inescapable imperative today.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government simply must do much better as an employer of our own people. How many private employers would try to retain their best workers and attract great new workers by attacking and furloughing the workforce, by accusing the employees of disloyalty, by freezing their pay, and then by compelling them to work for 35 days with no salary at all? It would never work for the vast majority of private-sector employers.

All over America, we read of workers demoralized and defeated, thinking of leaving their Federal jobs because of the sheer folly and cruelty of this most recent episode and because the President, I am sorry to report, is again threatening another shutdown with nothing but complicity from many of our friends across the aisle.

On top of all the anxiety induced by the shutdown, we know that between 30 and 35 percent of the Federal workforce is eligible to retire within the next 5 years. How will we replace them and replenish the ranks of this embattled and besieged workforce?

These are our people, Mr. Speaker. These are our workers. These are our constituents. These are the people who make America work.

Federal workers do not live the lifestyles of the rich and famous. They don't jet down to Mar-a-Lago at personal or government expense. And they can't afford the \$36 cheeseburger at the Trump Hotel.

The Secretary of Commerce, Wilbur Ross, will never be able to figure out why they can't just call up a friendly banker for a loan, just as Lara Trump will not be able to see why the 35-day shutdown caused something more than an eensy-weentsy “little bit of pain” for them as they are invited to suffer in service of the greater glory of the Trump administration agenda.

Our public servants, civilian and military alike, deserve better from us, whether they work as a civilian officer or uniformed officer at the Pentagon; whether they are safeguarding air travel or the air or the water or the climate or our food supply; whether they are taking care of our treasured national parks; or treating breast cancer patients or finding the cure for cystic fibrosis or multiple sclerosis; or running our museums; or cutting Social Security checks; or preparing the President's meals at the White House; or guarding the coastline with the Coast Guard; or making the justice system work as judges, prosecutors, defenders, clerks, and marshals. They deserve better from us.

They need a pay raise, not a pay freeze. They deserve our respect, not our contempt. They don't ask to be deified, but they don't deserve to be demonized.

They have an important job to do. Let's pay them for it. Let's invest in our Federal workforce. I urge all of our colleagues to come together to pass H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding. I would like to pick up where my friend from Maryland left off. They don't deserve to be deified, but they don't deserve to be demonized either. That doesn't just apply to our Federal workforce. That applies to so many elements of our conversation today.

I hope you have a chance, Mr. Speaker, to go watch the Rules Committee debate last night on this rule. You might have thought that, with a simple two-page resolution such as this one, we might have been up and out in about 10 minutes, making three amendments in order.

But, no, we spent the better part of almost 3 hours there talking with the committee experts on the issue, Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia and Mr. MEADOWS from North Carolina. You would be affected by the amount of agreement that those two gentlemen had.

□ 0930

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say you would be surprised, because you might know those two gentlemen as I do, you might know this issue as I do, and you might know its bipartisan roots and its bipartisan future as I do.

But if you don't watch that hearing, if you don't know the issue, if all you

do is see a bill that was dropped in the hopper just a couple of days ago, has had no markup in committee, has had no hearings, has had no witnesses, and has had no dialogue whatsoever on it, but happened to be dropped in the middle of the week where some of the more cynical among us expected us to still be in a government shutdown before the President brought us out of it, this might just look like a messaging statement to folks who view it through that lens.

It is so frustrating and disappointing to me because this is an issue on which we agree. My friend from Oklahoma, an appropriator, happens to be the ranking member up on the Rules Committee. In testimony last night, we are talking about not an insignificant amount of money in this bill; we are talking about not millions with an M, we are talking about billions with a B of dollars going out the door.

The question is: Where do the dollars come from?

The answer is: They are just going to come from other accounts these agencies already have.

I don't know what other account that is, and I think that is worth having a conversation about.

If you read through this language, Mr. Speaker, you will see no effort whatsoever to do what every single one of us knows needs to be done, and that is to find those Federal employees who make us proud at agencies every single day, reward that service, protect that service, encourage that service, and make sure retention plans are in place for those employees. There is not a line in here to target those high performers.

Equally, look through this legislation, Mr. Speaker, to find those folks whom I know—because I hear it from my veterans in my district every day, and I hear it from the leadership in the VA every day—find those folks who just do not want to show up and serve. Somehow they got involved in Federal service. They are the exception, not the rule. They bring their colleagues in Federal service down instead of lifting them up. They bring the folks they are intended to serve down instead of lifting them up. There is no effort to identify those folks and no effort to reward the high performers while trying to train up the low performers. In true government fashion, it says that the definition of success is to treat absolutely everybody the same.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one else doing this work other than us. The problem in the civil service system isn't that we protect employees. That is laud worthy. That is a laudable goal. What the problem is in civil service is we are the only ones who do the oversight. There is no other board of directors. It is us.

Yet we bring a bill to the floor that we claim raises our Federal employees up and praises our Federal employees. We didn't even give it the dignity of a hearing or a markup. We can do better

than that, and candidly, I think we will.

We will never know what would have happened had we not gotten started on the foot we got started on in January as we did. I particularly regret that for our freshmen who are trying to figure out what the tone and tenor is of this place. This isn't it. Apparently, Republicans got us in bad habits in the last session of just dropping bills in the hopper and bringing them to the floor the next day, no hearings, no markup. It was wrong then, and it is not wise now either.

We have a lot of choices to make going forward, Mr. Speaker.

Are we poisoning the well, or are we protecting it?

Are we tilling the fields, or are we spreading salt in them?

We don't need to deify our ideological opponents, but we don't need to demonize them either. There is more that unites this country than divides this country, Mr. Speaker. Our Federal employees do deserve our trust, our appreciation, and, yes, a paycheck at the end of the week for the work they have done on our behalf.

They also deserve a way to be recognized when they go above and beyond. They also deserve to know that folks on their team who are not up to the task today are either going to be trained up or moved out.

We can do those things together. For reasons that are not clear to me, we have not chosen to try. This could have been a bipartisan effort. This could have been part of a larger package, and it wasn't. I regret that.

I will tell my friend from Maryland I did not bring any additional speakers with me who would have shared that very same message, so when he is prepared to close as am I.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear friend from Georgia for his thoughtful comments, especially for conceding that the Federal workers do deserve a paycheck at the end of the week, and I am glad that we can start off a new season here where we agree that Federal workers deserve and need to be paid. I suppose we still have this difference about whether or not they deserve a pay raise.

Yes, the substance is clear. We are fighting for a 2.6 percent pay raise for the Federal civilian workforce to match the 2.6 percent pay raise that has gone into effect for the military servicemembers who are serving our country with their hard work and their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, our message is clear. There is a message that is built into there, because when you are deciding whether or not to give your workers a raise or give them a pay freeze or you are deciding whether or not to praise them or to compel them to work for free for 35 days or to furlough them,

there is a message built into that. So we are the employer of these 2 million people who have come to work for the Federal Government, and there is a message there.

It is not just the money for their families, it is not just the money to pay the mortgage and to pay the rent and for the car bills and for the food bills and for health insurance and so on. There is a message there, and the message is simple: we stand with the Federal workers.

That is the message. We embrace that message that is built into the pay raise here.

But I have to disagree with my friend if he says that all we are doing is sending that message that we stand with the Federal workers. That is not all we are doing, we are giving them a pay raise they deserve. We have got tens of thousands of people who work at the Pentagon who go dressed as military servicemembers every day, and we have tens of thousands who go dressed as civilians, they work side by side, and they work together for the country.

Shouldn't they all get a pay raise?

Don't all of them deserve a pay raise?

Now, Mr. Speaker, my friend invites us to believe that because we are giving the workforce a pay raise, we can't continue to implement civil service rules that are meant to get rid of the rare bad apple that you get in the Federal workforce.

Why not?

Why can't we use the other mechanisms that are in place to reward workers?

If we want to improve those, then I am so happy to work with my friend on the Rules Committee to develop legislation to do that. But I am afraid that is an irrelevant distraction from the matter at hand. The matter at hand today is whether or not we are going to give the same pay raise to civilian workers that we have given to military workers.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his astute analysis and his service on the Rules Committee, and I thank my good friend from Georgia for offering his recognition of the value of our Federal workers.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, I started my day, first of all, with supporting H.R. 21, and gathering with the leadership of the House and Senate recognizing that Social Security must be strengthened. But truly I joined in my long-term commitment for not only the survival of Social Security, but the survival of our families and seniors—3 million senior women living in poverty, 2 million senior men. These individuals have worked. They may have been Federal employees.

I then joined my colleagues, House and Senate, on supporting pay equity for women. And now I am on the floor dealing with a crucial component of survival in this Nation.

I thank Mr. CONNOLLY and the Oversight Committee for bringing this bill. It is important, as I speak about the needs, to emphasize that we can do nothing else but pass this bill, the Senate pass this bill, and the President signs this bill.

For the idea of paycheck inequality, for example, that will be debated later today, it is important to know that women working full-time still earn 80 percent on average for every dollar earned by men, and women of color face the brunt of inequality, African-American women 61 cents on the dollar, Latinas earning 53 cents on the dollar, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women earning 62 percent with white non-Hispanic men.

So what are we doing today?

We are saying that the executive order squeezing Federal workers in the middle of the shutdown by the President of the United States in an executive order is null and void.

As I left for Washington talking to TSO officers who had worked and worked with no pay as essential workers, one quietly said to me: Are we going to get our pay raise? Are you going to fight against the executive order?

Mr. Speaker, I said to them: We sure will.

We want Democrats and Republicans.

But I said: We sure will.

So I rise today to support this legislation that deals with the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019. Texas has over 270,000 Federal employees. I have 4,000 in my district. The cost of the pay raise would be approximately \$25 billion. President Trump's tax reform bill costs over 10 times that amount.

It is important to note that this is a 2.6 percent pay raise for Federal civilian workers and establishes pay parity between the military and service workers.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to say that Federal employees have been paid too much. They have been victims of attacks of, What do these people do? There have been charges of waste, fraud, and abuse. With the government shutdown we know what these workers do. They take care of our parks, they keep them safe. They keep the airways, the aviation industry, the aviation system in America and around the world alive with the best air traffic controllers in the world. They protect the airports with TSOs.

Mr. Speaker, I support enthusiastically the 2.6 percent increase. Let's do it now. Let the President sign the bill.

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

I am always affected by the words of the gentlewoman from Texas, but my answer is clear: No, everybody doesn't

deserve a pay raise all the time; it is true on my staff, it is true in my life, it is true in every private-sector company in the country, and it is true in the Federal Government too.

Now we won't be able to have that conversation because there was no hearing on this bill. We won't be able to improve that circumstance because this bill doesn't try to expand itself to that scope.

We are in a new age. I won't be able to close this debate, Mr. Speaker. My friend from Maryland will be able to close as is the privilege of the majority.

The other privilege of the majority is titling the bills as they are coming to the floor. This is the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act, and the definition of fairness in this case is that civilian workers be treated the same as military workers as it relates to a cost-of-living increase. That is worthy of debate.

I know many of my friends who represent the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area that have so many civilian Federal workers believe in that equity issue deeply and passionately and have worked to protect it over a long number of years. In the State of Georgia, we have many DOD employees, folks whose tempo changes regularly, folks who are called on with increasing frequency, folks who ask: Where shall I go when you send me?

That is qualitatively different service.

Should it be treated differently? Again, this is not the right place for that conversation. This is a debate on a rule about whether or not we will bring up a bill that the folks on the other side of the aisle absolutely have the votes to pass if they want to pass it.

In fact, it is language in the bill that we could absolutely move in a bipartisan way if we had it in the conversations. It is language that could have absolutely been part of the negotiations to end the government shutdown since this was a decision that the President made back in December of last year not to institute the 2.1. If folks had gone to the negotiating table, if folks had negotiated in good faith, if folks had said that this is what we need, and this is what we think is important, then we could have solved this long before now.

But this bill was dropped just days ago, again, with no hearing and no markups, and here it is before us.

□ 0945

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, as well as add any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I intend

to bring up a very simple amendment that would address just one of the questions that we would have addressed if we considered this issue important enough to have the committee of jurisdiction actually gather and hold a hearing on it; and that is the question of those who are delinquent in their taxes: those folks who have an outstanding tax bill, who have not tried to enter into a negotiated settlement, those who are not in a payment plan, but those who simply are not paying their Federal taxes, that they not be a part of this pay increase.

My constituents work hard every day of the week. They expect us to be doing the oversight. They expect us to be doing performance reviews. They expect us to be looking at who is showing up and who is going the extra mile, rewarding those folks who are going the extra mile, training those folks up who are not, and not rewarding those folks who are falling well below the standards that each and every one of us expect as taxpayers and, candidly, even more so, each and every Federal employee expects of his or her colleagues.

I want good work to be recognized with good pay, Mr. Speaker, but what would be better than this bill is a comprehensive plan from the Committee on Oversight and Reform to reform the civil service system so that that is not an aspirational goal but an absolute certainty that the American people can count on.

The best thing we can do to respect our fellow employees, Mr. Speaker, is not to have a messaging bill come to the House of Representatives. The best thing we can do for our Federal employees is to make sure that the reputation that travels across the land is not one of underperformance but is one of overperformance.

We are the only ones who can deal with the issues of bad apples spoiling an entire barrel. We are the only ones who can do it. We owe it to every agency in this land to be their partner in getting that done. By defeating the previous question and including this amendment, we will take a small step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, unless my friend is prepared to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman from Georgia has given me a lot to think about here.

The very first thing that I need to clear up is that 85 percent of the Federal workforce does not live in the national capital region. It is true that the local delegations from Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia are sensitive to these continuing assaults on the Federal workforce because we have so many workers who live here, but, again, 85 percent of the workforce lives all over the country.

I just learned that there are 100,000 civilian Federal workers in Georgia who also were affected by this government shutdown and lockout of the Fed-

eral workers, and I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Georgia heard the same kinds of complaints from his constituents that I heard from mine about not being able to balance their checkbooks, not being able to pay the mortgage or pay the rent because of what took place with the shutdown.

The President froze Federal worker pay without any hearings. The President froze Federal worker pay without any markups, and he did it without consulting any of us. That is something that he did.

Now, of course, we know that the 115th Congress, the last Congress, became famous—or perhaps I should say infamous—for being the most closed Congress in U.S. history, bringing us the most number of closed rules on the floor, shutting down debate, bringing us so many bills without hearings or markup.

We would have loved to have been able to have hearings and markup for this bill, but the Committee on Oversight and Reform wasn't organized until yesterday. We are all recovering from the shocks of the Federal Government shutdown. We are all trying to catch our breath from what has been imposed on the country. We have been consumed entirely with the question of the government shutdown.

So when the new rules come into focus and are activated on March 1, which is when they are supposed to come in, we have every intention of being a dramatically more open Congress than what we saw in the last Congress.

But we appreciate the push from our friends. They should give us the push. Certainly, they know what it is like to close down debate because they did it for so many years.

Now I understand they are suggesting, as a substitute resolution, what they want instead is a prohibition on raises for Federal employees with delinquent tax debt.

It is very clear that the Federal civilian workforce is graded on an annual basis, and you can get five different kinds of rankings. These are dealt with in the promotion process, in all kinds of personnel actions, including exclusion and separation in cases of delinquency where Federal workers are not performing. So the idea that the Federal civil service has existed all of this time without the ability to have incentives and disincentives and sanctions for nonperformance is, of course, quite apart from reality.

I am amazed that my friends would be immodest enough to raise the question of taxes in their opposition to this legislation. The first problem, of course, is that they passed a \$1.5 trillion tax cut for the wealthiest corporations and people in America—\$1.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, a trillion dollars is a thousand billion dollars.

So they piled what it is going to be a \$1.9 trillion addition to our national debt over the next decade, at least. The

Congressional Budget Office estimates that it adds at least \$1.9 trillion to our debt, yet they come back and say that they don't want to give a 2.6 percent pay increase to our Federal workers, who were just furloughed or compelled to go to work with no pay for the last 35 days.

Prohibition on raises for Federal employees with delinquent tax debt, that is their attempt to distract everybody from the pay raise that America's Federal workforce needs.

What about the President of the United States? What about his taxes? Are they finally going to support release of President Trump's taxes, which is what the last four decades of Presidents, Republicans and Democrats alike, have done?

No. They maintain a demure and respectful silence towards the President on that one. They are not interested in the President releasing his taxes, but they want to use the fact that maybe there is a Federal worker who wasn't able to pay his or her taxes as justification for not giving America's Federal workforce a pay raise. That is quite remarkable to me, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, you have the benefit of being there in the chair where I used to get to stand from time to time to preside over these proceedings, and you know that feeling. You may be a partisan on the weekends when you are at a Democratic rally, but when you stand in that chair, you don't stand there as a Democrat. I didn't stand there as a Republican. You stand there as the representative of the entire U.S. House of Representatives to make sure we have a full, fair, and free debate. In fact, you have got a wonderful team there in the Parliamentarian's and the Clerk's Office to make sure that all goes unaffected from one leadership to the next.

In fact, we go back hundreds of years in terms of trying to honor the precedence and the practices that this Chamber has brought together. We do that because, when you govern this institution with that mantra of fair play, we get better results in the end: we spend less time arguing about the process; we spend more time working together on progress; and we get to where it is each and every one of our constituents wants us to go.

My friend from Maryland and I, we are in a tough trap here in January. Of all the things I thought we would be talking about down here as it affects a Federal employee pay increase, the President's conversations about his tax forms in a campaign 3 years ago wasn't one of them.

But somehow, because of the nature of discourse today, if you have a sharp stick with the President's name on it, you just kind of have to work that in whenever the debate gives you an opportunity. It never once brings us clos-

er to solutions, but it apparently makes folks feel better from time to time, makes their constituents feel better from time to time.

We are going to have to ask ourselves sometime soon: Did we get elected to make a point or did we get elected to make a difference? I know what that answer is for me, and I want this, Mr. Speaker, to go down as a missed opportunity.

This could have been a bill that we spent our time on the floor talking through together, as Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. MEADOWS did just last night in the Rules Committee as representatives of the committee of jurisdiction on this issue, of all the things we have in common from coast to coast, from north to south, as it relates to honoring our Federal workforce and improving our Federal workforce.

And, for whatever reason, the leadership decision was made that we wouldn't do this in a partnership way, we wouldn't do this in a bipartisan way, we wouldn't do this in a full-throated legislative process way, but we would just craft this bill, drop it on the floor, and force a vote.

We can miss a couple of opportunities, Mr. Speaker, to come together. We have already missed a few in January. We can miss a few more. But I know my friend from Maryland shares my concern.

There is going to come a time—and it happened to Republicans, too—where you miss one too many opportunities to work together and you poison that partnership well for weeks or months or, in worst case scenarios, even years to come.

America can't afford that, Mr. Speaker, and each and every one of us is better than that. We haven't found our stride yet. If we defeat this rule today, perhaps that will be a step in finding our stride. If we defeat the previous question and consider my amendment, that might be a step in finding our stride. Even in the absence of those eventualities, we still must commit ourselves to one another to find that stride moving forward.

It is to the disadvantage of every Federal employee in the Nation to make this conversation about the importance of the work they do look like an "us" against "them." When it comes to folks who wear a flag on their shoulder, when it comes to folks who show up in service of their fellow man, there is no "us" and "them"; there is just an "us." Any opportunity we use to either distort that understanding or fail to recognize that understanding does violence to us all.

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

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

My friend from Georgia eloquently calls us back to bipartisanship, and I could not agree more. I would love nothing more than for him and for all

of our colleagues across the aisle to join us in supporting the 2.6 percent pay raise for America's Federal workforce.

I almost feel as though, if we were to add the names of our distinguished colleagues on the other side to the bill, they might support it. So I would reopen that offer and restate that offer: We invite everybody to come on and to be cosponsors with us in giving America's Federal workforce a pay raise right now.

But we do have to think about this in bipartisan-nonpartisan terms.

It was the President of the United States who maligned the Federal workforce, apparently, from his perspective, by calling them Democrats, and there are two problems with that.

One, it is not true. I have got lots of Republicans who work as Federal employees. I have got lots of Independents who work as Federal employees, as well as Democrats, as well as Greens, as well as people who are not affiliated with any party at all and are probably sick of a lot of the partisanship that goes on here in Washington.

Think about what the real problem with the President deriding Federal workers as Democrats is. The real problem is that they are Americans. We are all Americans. We stand together as Americans. That is why we have got to stand behind our Federal workforce.

I want to just clear up one other thing that has been bugging me, because the gentleman from Georgia is so persuasive in his tactics, and he kind of mixed apples and oranges.

We are talking about a pay raise for the workforce, and he said: Well, maybe most of the workers deserve one, but there might be some who don't.

I just want to state generally what the procedure is for evaluating Federal workers. Federal agencies use formal performance-rating programs for almost all of their career employees, typically with five different levels. The ratings are used in deciding on promotions, merit pay increases, cash awards, or discipline.

□ 1000

In the most severe cases, low-performing employees can be disciplined and removed from their jobs.

Now, the gentleman, I am sure, has some ideas for how we can improve that system and make it better. By all means, let's discuss that, but let's not cloud the issue of the fact that our workers need a raise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Woodall of Georgia or a designee.

That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Sec. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON RAISE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE WITH DELINQUENT TAX DEBT

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any other provision of this Act, during calendar year 2019 any Federal employee with delinquent tax debt may not receive a salary increase.

(b) DEFINITION OF DELINQUENT TAX DEBT.—In this section, the term “delinquent tax debt”—

(1) means a Federal tax liability that—
 (A) has been assessed by the Secretary of the Treasury under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(B) may be collected by the Secretary by levy or by a proceeding in court; and

(2) does not include a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 190, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—232

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

Kim	Murphy	Scott, David
Kind	Nadler	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)
Krishnamoorthi	Neal	Shalala
Kuster (NH)	Neguse	Sherman
Lamb	Norcross	Sherrill
Langevin	O'Halleran	Sires
Larsen (WA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin
Larson (CT)	Omar	Smith (WA)
Lawrence	Pallone	Soto
Lawson (FL)	Panetta	Spanberger
Lee (CA)	Pappas	Speier
Lee (NV)	Pascrell	Stanton
Levin (CA)	Perlmutter	Stevens
Levin (MI)	Peters	Suozi
Lewis	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Phillips	Takano
Lipinski	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Loeb sack	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Porter	Titus
Lowenthal	Pressley	Tlaib
Lowe y	Price (NC)	Tonko
Lujan	Quigley	Torres (CA)
Luria	Raskin	Torres Small
Lynch	Rice (NY)	(NM)
Malinowski	Richmond	Trahan
Maloney,	Rose (NY)	Trone
Carolyn B.	Rouda	Underwood
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Van Drew
Matsui	Ruiz	Vargas
McAdams	Ruppersberger	Veasey
McBath	Rush	Vela
McCollum	Ryan	Velázquez
McEachin	Sánchez	Visclosky
McGovern	Sarbanes	Wasserman
McNerney	Scanlon	Schultz
Meeks	Schakowsky	Waters
Meng	Schiff	Watson Coleman
Moore	Schneider	Welch
Morelle	Schrader	Wexton
Moulton	Schrier	Wild
Mucarsel-Powell	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Abraham	Foxx (NC)	Marshall
Aderholt	Fulcher	Massie
Allen	Gaetz	Mast
Amash	Gallagher	McCarthy
Amodei	Gianforte	McCaul
Armstrong	Gibbs	McClintock
Arrington	Gohmert	McHenry
Babin	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley
Bacon	Gooden	Meadows
Baird	Gosar	Meuser
Balderson	Granger	Miller
Banks	Graves (GA)	Mitchell
Barr	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Biggs	Green (TN)	Newhouse
Bilirakis	Griffith	Norman
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Nunes
Brady	Guest	Olson
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Hagedorn	Palmer
Buchanan	Harris	Pence
Buck	Hartzler	Perry
Bucshon	Hern, Kevin	Posey
Budd	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Burchett	Hice (GA)	Reed
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Byrne	Hill (AR)	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Holding	Riggleman
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Roby
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Huizenga	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Roy
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Cook	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Crawford	Katko	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Duncan	LaMalfa	Spano
Dunn	Lamborn	Staubert
Emmer	Latta	Stefanik
Estes	Lesko	Stell
Ferguson	Long	Steube
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Stewart
Fleischmann	Lucas	Stivers
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Fortenberry	Marchant	Thompson (PA)

Thornberry	Walorski	Wittman
Timmons	Waltz	Womack
Tipton	Watkins	Woodall
Turner	Weber (TX)	Wright
Upton	Webster (FL)	Yoho
Wagner	Wenstrup	Young
Walberg	Westerman	Zeldin
Walden	Williams	
Walker	Wilson (SC)	

NOT VOTING—10

Bost	LaHood	Shimkus
Comer	Mullin	Wilson (FL)
Davis, Rodney	Payne	
Jones	Sensenbrenner	

□ 1030

Messrs. CARTER of Texas, BUCSHON, and MCCARTHY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana and JEFFRIES changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 189, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—231

Adams	Davis (CA)	Jayapal
Aguilar	Davis, Danny K.	Jeffries
Allred	Dean	Johnson (GA)
Axne	DeFazio	Johnson (TX)
Barragán	DeGette	Kaptur
Bass	DeLauro	Keating
Beatty	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Bera	Delgado	Kennedy
Beyer	Demings	Khanna
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Blumenauer	Deutch	Kilmer
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Kim
Bonamici	Doggett	Kind
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick
F.	F.	Krishnamoorthi
Brindisi	Engel	Kuster (NH)
Brown (MD)	Escobar	Lamb
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Langevin
Bustos	Españillat	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Evans	Larson (CT)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Lawrence
Cárdenas	Fletcher	Lawson (FL)
Carson (IN)	Foster	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Frankel	Lee (NV)
Case	Fudge	Levin (CA)
Casten (IL)	Gabbard	Levin (MI)
Castor (FL)	Gallego	Lewis
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Lieu, Ted
Chu, Judy	García (IL)	Lipinski
Cicilline	García (TX)	Loeb sack
Cisneros	Golden	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Gomez	Lowenthal
Clarke (NY)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lowe y
Clay	Gottheimer	Lujan
Cleaver	Green (TX)	Luria
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lynch
Cohen	Haaland	Malinowski
Connolly	Harder (CA)	Maloney,
Cooper	Hastings	Carolyn B.
Correa	Hayes	Maloney, Sean
Costa	Heck	Matsui
Courtney	Higgins (NY)	McAdams
Cox (CA)	Hill (CA)	McBath
Craig	Himes	McCollum
Crist	Horn, Kendra S.	McEachin
Crow	Horsford	McGovern
Cuellar	Houlihan	McNerney
Cummings	Hoyer	Meeks
Cunningham	Huffman	Meng
Davids (KS)	Jackson Lee	Moore

Morelle	Rose (NY)	Suoizzi	Mullin	Schrader	Shimkus
Moulton	Rouda	Swaizwell (CA)	Payne	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (FL)
Mucarsel-Powell	Roybal-Allard	Takano			
Murphy	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)			
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)			
Napolitano	Rush	Titus			
Neal	Ryan	Tlaib			
Neguse	Sánchez	Tonko			
Norcross	Sarbanes	Torres (CA)			
O'Halleran	Scanlon	Torres Small			
Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky	(NM)			
Omar	Schiff	Trahan			
Pallone	Schneider	Trone			
Panetta	Schrier	Underwood			
Pappas	Scott (VA)	Van Drew			
Pascrell	Scott, David	Vargas			
Perlmutter	Serrano	Veasey			
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Vela			
Peterson	Shalala	Velázquez			
Phillips	Sherman	Visclosky			
Pingree	Sherrill	Wasserman			
Pocan	Sires	Schultz			
Porter	Slotkin	Waters			
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman			
Price (NC)	Soto	Welch			
Quigley	Spanberger	Wexton			
Raskin	Speier	Wild			
Rice (NY)	Stanton	Yarmuth			
Richmond	Stevens				

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—12

Babin	Comer	Jones
Boat	Davis, Rodney	LaHood

Mullin
Payne

Schrader
Sensenbrenner

Shimkus
Wilson (FL)

□ 1039

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORKFORCE
PAY RAISE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 790. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 87 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. 790.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1042

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. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. SABLAN in the chair.

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

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019, along with my fellow colleagues of the local delegation. I pay special thanks to Chairman CONNOLLY and Majority Leader HOYER for their leadership on this very important piece of legislation.

H.R. 790, as amended, would authorize a 2.6 percent pay raise for Federal civilian workers for 2019, the same raise that our military servicemembers are receiving this year.

Historically, Congress has tried to ensure parity in pay increases between Federal civilian employees and military servicemembers. This bill would continue this longstanding tradition.

The bill would provide the pay raise to Federal employees in the competitive and excepted services, blue-collar workers, members of the career Senior

Executive Service, and employees in the scientific and senior-level positions.

The men and women of our civil service deserve this small increase in pay because they have endured so much during the last several years. They were subjected, Mr. Chair, to repeated and unrelenting attacks on their pay and on their benefits.

□ 1045

They have suffered through pay freezes, hiring freezes, higher pension costs, and furloughs due to sequestration and government shutdowns.

Since 2011, Federal workers have contributed nearly \$200 billion to help reduce our country's deficit and to fund other government programs. These hardworking, dedicated Federal workers include the 800,000 employees who were furloughed or forced to work without pay for 35 days during the longest shutdown in our great Nation's history.

The men and women of our civil service were held hostage to a political dispute over funding for a border wall that the President had stated over and over again would be paid for by Mexico. There is something wrong with this picture.

They include members of the Coast Guard, TSA screeners, Department of Agriculture workers who help farmers and ranchers, FAA air traffic controllers and safety inspectors, FDA food inspectors, the FBI, EPA pollution inspectors, Border Patrol agents, and Secret Service agents.

Given all the hardship Federal employees have experienced, they deserve a modest pay increase to help make up for the years of freezes and negligible increases and to help offset the cost of inflation.

The pay increase also would help the Federal Government compete against the private sector to recruit and retain highly qualified candidates to serve the American people.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his words on the importance of making sure that our Federal workforce is properly compensated. Indeed, this is an important subject.

Mr. Chairman, I guess my question here today is, fundamentally, if it is so important, then why haven't we had a hearing? Why haven't we had a markup? Why the rush to push this bill on the floor?

Not too long ago, my good friend from Maryland, the chairman of the committee, would be on this same floor arguing the same thing: Why are we not having a markup? Why are we not going through regular order?

Mr. Chairman, I remind this body that, less than 30 days ago, there was a vote on the House floor that said we are going to return to regular order; we

are going to make sure that every bill goes through the committee, has a markup, and actually has fair debate.

Yet, here we are, less than 30 days into this new Congress, and we are putting forth a messaging bill that, quite frankly, has not been vetted. The amendment process has not come out of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

I will also say, and this is no laughing matter, I have been one of the few Members on our side of the aisle on this committee who has actively engaged in trying to make sure that our Federal workforce is not only compensated, but properly recognized.

Mr. Chairman, here is my problem. According to Federal workers, over 25 percent of them believe that raises do not happen based on merit, that everyone gets a raise. Indeed, this bill does that. It says, regardless of how you perform, we are going to give everybody the same increase.

Now, that same Federal workforce went even further. One-third of them said that we don't do enough to get rid of poor performers.

What message are we sending to the Federal workforce here today? We are rushing a bill that has not gone through committee. We have not provided meaningful amendments that are actually appropriate. We have a Federal workforce that says they don't get raises based on the merits of their work, on the hard work they put forth. Indeed, they are saying that a third of the employees are getting compensated regardless of their performances.

Now, when we look at that, what message does this body send to the Federal workforce? It says that it doesn't matter what kind of job you do. I think that is a terrible message to send.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, as we look at this bill—and I am sure we will debate the merits of this particular piece of legislation—we have the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, here, and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, both Members who I respect greatly. Yet, this rush to put this messaging bill on the floor does nothing but damage the underlying support that many of us on both sides of the aisle have for the Federal workforce.

I strongly object to this particular measure. Let's slow it down. Let's go through the appropriate time to make sure that, indeed, we have a markup, that we have a bill.

The chairman knows full well that Federal workers, not only in and around Washington, D.C., but across the Nation, deserve our full attention, and this deserves a full debate.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear that there are many Federal workers who are suffering and who have suffered.

The message that we send to them is that we care about them, and we know that they give their blood, sweat, and tears over and over again. That is one of the messages we send.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the distinguished new chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. I am so proud to call him that.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say, I heard the arguments from my friend from North Carolina, and I know he does care about the Federal employees, but his arguments ring hollow when you support a 35-day shutdown of the Federal Government.

If you believe in regular order, then you never shut down the Federal Government, nor do you advise the President of the United States to shut down the Federal Government, nor do you use shutdowns as a tool to get some policy goal achieved.

That is never acceptable. It shouldn't be acceptable to Washington. It is not acceptable to the American people. It certainly is not acceptable to the 800,000 Federal employees and an equal number of Federal contract employees and small business owners who were affected negatively by this shutdown.

So it is hard to listen to a lecture about regular order in the midst of that wreckage.

That is what we are trying to do here. It is not a messaging bill to embarrass anybody. It is a bill to try to begin to restore the integrity of respect and dignity to the men and women who serve this country. They are called Federal employees. They were innocent victims of political games, as if they were pawns, Mr. Chairman, for a wall. We are just trying to begin the process of making them whole again.

I thank the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, for bringing this bill to the floor. The bill would end the current freeze for Federal employees, recommended by President Trump, and provide hardworking civil servants with a 2.6 percent pay increase, matching that for military employees.

On the heels of this largest government shutdown in U.S. history, and the longest, I believe it is appropriate for the House of Representatives to take up this legislation to make a statement in the people's body that we do respect the work of our civil servants and our Federal employees and that we are prepared to provide concrete measures to do that.

During the shutdown, some of these individuals reported to work without knowing when, or if, they would receive their next paycheck, while others were willing to work, but were told they couldn't.

Even though the Federal Government has reopened, most Federal employees

are still waiting to receive that first paycheck. Under statute, Federal employees should have received a 2.1 percent pay increase for 2019. Instead, the recommendation from the White House was zero.

This bill represents a pay increase for Federal employees above that statutory level equal to an additional 0.5 percent over and above the statutory level that would have otherwise been provided.

While the House of Representatives passed appropriations bills that included a 1.9 percent pay increase for Federal employees, the continuing resolution agreed to by the House and Senate did not reverse the President's pay freeze. This bill would.

Historically, Congress has tried to ensure parity in pay between Federal civilian employees and military servicemembers. This bill would continue the tradition of pay parity for which I have advocated since I came to Congress 10 years ago.

A Federal employee pay increase of 2.6 percent is, in my view, further justified, as the distinguished chairman of the committee pointed out, by the hardships just suffered and those suffered over the last 10 years: three pay freezes, hiring freezes, compensation cuts, and benefit cuts. Federal employees are the only group on the planet that actually has contributed nearly \$200 billion to deficit reduction.

In 9 of the last 10 years, Congress has failed to enact an increase in basic pay consistent with the statute. Not true on the military side. That is why we are trying to have pay parity.

In 8 of the last 10 years, basic pay increases trailed increases in the cost of living itself.

I will point out that the legislation in front of us has been endorsed by the American Federation of Government Employees; the National Treasury Employees Union; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers; the Senior Executives Association; the Federal Managers Association; and the Professional Managers Association.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support from these groups.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

January 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), which represents more than 700,000 federal and District of Columbia government employees within 70 agencies, I write urging you to support H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019, introduced by Representative Connolly (D-VA), when it comes to the floor this week. This legislation provides federal workers with a FY 2019 pay adjustment of 2.6 percent. This modest adjustment would allow federal employees to make up some of the purchasing power they lost over the last decade and restore the long tradition of parity in the rate of adjustment for civilian and military employees of the United States government.

January 25, 2019 marked the end of our nation's longest government shutdown, and federal employees have been without a paycheck since December 21st. As a result of the funding lapse, many federal employees have fallen behind on their monthly bills and are experiencing serious financial hardship. Although some federal employees make more, among AFGE's own membership, the average take home pay is just \$500 per week after they pay their taxes, health insurance premiums, and mandatory retirement contributions. Many federal employees were struggling to make ends meet before the shutdown, and H.R. 790 would not only help agencies recruit new employees, and retain a workforce battered by the shutdown, compensation cuts enacted in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, it would also demonstrate that the Congress values the federal workforce's dedication and commitment to serving the American public.

For decades, Congress supported pay adjustment parity between federal and military employees. The civilian workforce not only works alongside the warfighters to keep our nation safe, they are also public servants who have dedicated their lives to providing the American public with invaluable benefits services. Federal employees work across the country securing our borders, keeping travelers safe, providing benefits to the elderly and disabled, caring for our veterans, and keeping our air and water safe and clean. Unfortunately, in recent years pay adjustment parity has not been upheld and federal civilian salaries have continued to lag standards set by private employers. H.R. 790 would help narrow this gap.

As you work to pass legislation to fund the remaining seven appropriations bills, AFGE urges you to support H.R. 790 when it comes to the floor this week, and we strongly urge you to support inclusion of a 2.6 percent federal employee pay adjustment in the final funding measure for FY 2019.

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,
National President.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY
EMPLOYEES UNION,
January 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Treasury Employees Union, which represents over 150,000 federal employees in 33 agencies, I urge you to support H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019, which would provide federal workers a 2.6 percent pay increase for 2019 and ensure pay parity with the military, with whom they frequently work in service to the nation.

At the end of August, the President sent a letter to Congress reiterating the call in his Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Budget Request for a pay freeze for federal workers. If not for the President's decision to implement a pay freeze, the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act (5 USC 5303) indicates that federal employees should receive a 2.1 percent pay raise in January 2019, prior to any amount being provided for locality pay rate increases. This formula is designed to ensure that the gap between federal government and private sector wages does not further deteriorate. According to the most recent Federal Pay Agent Report, the current pay disparity is over 30 percent.

Like all American workers and middle-class taxpayers, federal employees face ever-increasing costs of living, with rising utility, health care and food bills, along with school loan and rent or mortgage obligations. Due to a three-year pay freeze and five subsequent years of below-market pay raises that were lower than the amounts called for under current law, federal employees have

seen their wages fall further behind the private sector, which has adversely impacted them and their families.

Moreover, if the federal government is to have the ability to compete with the private sector in recruiting and retaining a skilled workforce, it is essential that the federal government provide its workers a pay increase. The federal government relies on qualified and professional civil servants that live and work in every state and congressional district across the country to carry out our nation's laws and programs, providing critical services for our nation and the American people.

Now, after suffering through a 35-day shutdown that caused unimaginable hardship for hundreds of thousands of federal workers, their families, and their communities, it is important to ensure that employees are able to afford the increased fees and penalties that they suffered as a result. All federal employees deserve an adequate pay raise and we urge your support for H.R. 790 in appreciation for their service.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2019.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), including thousands of federal government employees, I write to strongly support the "Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019," H.R. 790, which would increase federal employee salaries for calendar year 2019 by 2.6 percent. AFSCME urges you to vote for this bill to demonstrate your support for America's dedicated and hardworking federal workers.

A salary increase is necessary because expert analysis demonstrates that when contrasted position by position, federal workers' wages lag below employees in the nonfederal sector—both in the private sector and in state and local governments. In fact, federal employees are significantly underpaid in numerous occupations. Furthermore, since 2010, as a direct result of congressional legislation that reduced pay and benefits, federal employees have had their compensation cut by more than \$180 billion (over 10 years). Congress should take action to reverse these cuts and close this pay gap.

To recruit, hire, and retain a qualified capable federal government workforce, America must pay competitive salaries. This is vital to continue attracting the best and brightest to our public service. Unfortunately, during the last two years, the federal government's hiring freeze and shutdowns have lowered morale, forced many federal employees to cover others employees' job responsibilities, and reduced the federal government's effectiveness. H.R. 790 would help address these challenges and move us forward.

AFSCME endorses this important legislation and urges you to vote for the "Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019," H.R. 790.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,

January 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 90,000 represented members of the Inter-

national Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), we are writing regarding the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019 (HR 790), legislation sponsored by Virginia Congressman Gerry Connolly that is scheduled for full House consideration this week. After the longest government shutdown in the history of the United States, which impacted some 800,000 federal workers and their families, IFPTE is urging you to support pay parity between military and civilian workers by voting in support of this bill.

After three consecutive years of pay freezes, followed by meager across-the-board adjustments, federal workers have seen their incomes decrease by nearly 15% with respect to inflation over the last eight years. Therefore, IFPTE feels it is both fiscally responsible and reflective of the income sacrificed by federal employees to adopt the longstanding practice of pay parity between civilian workers and the military by supporting HR 790 calling for a 2.6% federal pay increase.

As Congress works to negotiate an acceptable solution to pass the remaining FY19 appropriations bills, IFPTE urges that whatever action is taken—whether it be a Continuing Resolution (CR) or a full FY19 Minibus that includes all or some of the seven outstanding spending measures, we believe that quickly approving a 2.6% civilian pay raise is more than reasonable. This number is reflective of pay parity with the military pay raise approved last year as a part of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) and is reflective of the many years of sacrifices made by federal workers, including enduring a senseless 35-day government shutdown.

IFPTE does recognize the acute difficulties facing Congress in these contentious times, but we simply ask that the men and women who work hard every day in the trenches to deliver excellence for the taxpayer not be harmed any more than they already have by the political turmoil in Washington.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PAUL SHEARON,
President.
MATTHEW BIGGS,
*Secretary-Treasurer/
Legislative Director.*

SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION,
January 29, 2019.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
*Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER AND REPRESENTATIVE CONNOLLY: On behalf of the Senior Executives Association (SEA)—which represents the interests of career federal executives in the Senior Executive Service (SES), and those in Senior Level (SL), Scientific and Professional (ST), equivalent executive positions, and other senior career leaders—I write to convey our support for H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

For the past decade the federal workforce has been treated as the nation's piggy bank, with nearly \$200 billion in pay and benefits being taken for debt reduction and other purposes. Providing all civilian federal employees with a 2.6% raise in 2019, especially following the shutdown, is an important step to ensure the government can attract and retain the talent it needs to serve the American public in a competitive labor market. Moreover, reestablishing pay parity with the uniformed services is applauded and welcomed.

This legislation sends a signal that Congress is serious about ensuring the federal

government is an employer of choice. For too long race-to-the-bottom policies related to the federal workforce have become the norm. It is our hope that the silver lining of the shutdown is that the American people now better understand what government does for them every day, how dedicated the professionals who work for them in the government are, and that Congress and the administration will find ways to work together to ensure our federal government has the personnel, tools, and resources necessary to fulfil the duties assigned to it.

SEA is deeply concerned that neglect of federal workforce capabilities in recent years have resulted in an increased risk of government failure, as outlined in a paper we released last week. Strengthening the Senior Executive Service (SES) and civil service and advocating for cultivation of the public service leadership profession are among our top organizational priorities in the 116th Congress. I hope that passage of this legislation is just the beginning of concerted efforts to modernize and strengthen our civil service, to bring data-driven approaches to management and compensation, and much more.

Thank you for your steadfast support of our federal workforce and your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

BILL VALDEZ,
President,
Senior Executives Association.

FEDERAL MANAGERS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, January 29, 2019.

Hon. GERRY CONNOLLY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONNOLLY: On behalf of the managers and supervisors currently serving our nation in the federal government and whose interests are represented by the Federal Managers Association (FMA), we extend our strongest support for your bill, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019 (H.R. 790). This legislation provides a much-deserved 2.6 percent pay raise for 2019, and addresses the inequity federal employees faced in recent years due to pay freezes and minimal raises.

The federal workforce ensures the safety of our borders, protects the nation's food supply, cares for our elderly and veterans, and serves alongside our military forces. But the minimal increases in pay received do not reflect the duties of these dedicated workers. It is time for the federal workforce to be recognized for their dedication to serving our country at home and abroad, and your legislation does that.

In addition to providing fair wages to federal employees, FMA believes H.R. 790 will help to combat the problem of morale, recruitment, and retention in the federal government, particularly in the aftermath of the partial government shutdown. As the federal government continues to struggle with these issues, your bill is a step towards offering competitive salaries, attracting and keeping the brightest and best to the federal workforce. By calling for wages that fairly compensate the abilities and responsibilities of the federal workforce, you recognize the need to ensure a fully engaged federal workforce that remains dedicated to serving the nation.

Thank you for your continued support of our federal workforce.

Sincerely,

RENEE JOHNSON,
National President.

PROFESSIONAL MANAGERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2019.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER AND REPRESENTATIVE CONNOLLY: On behalf of the Professional Managers Association—the non-profit professional association that has, since 1981, represented professional managers, management officials, and non-bargaining unit employees at the Internal Revenue Service (IRS)—I write to endorse H.R. 790 the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

Pay parity between federal civilian employees and members of the military has long been the norm, until recent years in which the federal workforce has been faced with constant attacks that have taken billions in earned pay and benefits out of the pockets of hardworking middle class Americans. The result of abandoning pay parity has been an ever-growing imbalance between the compensation of federal workers and the broader labor market.

In a highly competitive economy in which the types of skills and abilities the government needs are in high demand across the board, this legislation providing a 2.6% pay increase across the board to federal civilian employees can help begin to close the gap. Especially on the heels of the embarrassing 35-day government shutdown, it is important for Congress to ensure the government is a competitive employer with good pay and benefits offerings.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue, and for your steadfast support of our federal workforce.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. BURGER,
Executive Director,
Professional Managers Association.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that our Federal civil servants are like any other workforce. More than 900,000 of those Federal employees earn less than \$60,000 a year. They are not rich. They are not living high on the hog. They deserve and need this adjustment, especially after the longest, most reckless shutdown of the government in American history.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend, the ranking member of the committee, and a champion for the American people.

□ 1100

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his hard work on the committee and in the United States Congress.

There are just a couple of key things to keep in mind. I am against this bill. The average yearly pay for a government worker is \$85,000. CBO did a study. Those with college degrees who work in the Federal Government make 21 percent more than people with college degrees in the private sector; those without a college degree, 53 percent more than those in the private sector.

Think about what this bill says. All of those hardworking taxpayers in the private sector, hey, you are already making less, but now you are going to have more of your tax dollars go to pay people—who are already making more money than you—to get a raise. How is that fair?

Even worse, think about what the Democrats are doing on H.R. 1, their signature legislation. H.R. 1, they are saying to those same people who are already making more money than folks in the private sector, they are saying to those private-sector taxpayers, Hey, guess what? We are not only going to give them a raise, even though they are already making more than you, we are going to give them 6 paid days to work on campaigns, 6 vacation days where they get to work on campaigns. And, oh, by the way, they may be helping the very candidate you are against. Such a deal for the taxpayers.

That is why I am a “no” on this bill. I am thinking about the taxpayers in the 11th District of North Carolina, the Fourth District of Ohio, and all across this country. Tell me how that is fair.

Oh, I forgot. There is one more thing the Democrats want to do. H.R. 1, they want to make election day a paid holiday for Federal employees. This is not where we need to be. This is not the respect taxpayers deserve.

Mr. Chair, I would urge a “no” vote, and I appreciate the good work Congressman MEADOWS is doing on this legislation. Frankly, he is right. We probably should have had a hearing and talked about this. Maybe the Democrats didn't want to talk about the fact that people in the private sector are making less with the same kind of education than those who work for the Federal Government.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I am, of course, not shocked that those who wanted to shut down the government and keep it shut had Federal employees making nothing. I am not shocked that they don't want to give Federal employees a cost-of-living adjustment.

Now, I could spend a lot of time responding to my friend from Ohio about the qualifications necessary to run NASA and to work at NASA, or the FBI, or the CDC, or the other agencies that require high levels of skill to work.

I am sure my friend from Ohio has read the government reports from the council that is charged with the responsibility of determining whether we are paying comparable wages who say, no, we are not. As a matter of fact, we are substantially under, if you compare apples to apples, educational requirements, and skills requirements to the private sector, similar requirements.

He doesn't mention that because the averages, they sound just much better.

Now, of course, the average salary on the Washington National's team is a little higher than that. Why, because their skill levels are higher than almost anybody else in the country.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Representative CONNOLLY and Representative WEXTON for their hard work, and I want to thank my friend, the chairman of the committee. Representative CONNOLLY, of course, has been a long-time advocate of the pay and benefits, and retaining, and being able to recruit people who have those kinds of skill levels.

You better be careful; some 30 to 40 percent of our people are getting pretty close or are at retirement age, and they are going to say, you keep shutting them down and not keeping their salary level, unlike our salary, which has deteriorated now for 10 years in terms of its purchasing value. But averages are averages.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. CONNOLLY in particular. He has been an outstanding advocate for many Federal civilian employees living and working in northern Virginia and across the national capital region, and, indeed, around the country.

Let me disclose, I represent 62,000 Federal employees. You are not shocked that I am for Federal employees. But when I was in the State Senate, I represented a miniscule amount of State employees, and I was for paying them comparable wages so that we could hire competent, capable, committed people to serve my constituents.

This shutdown just showed what kind of pain it has caused. Do you think those high-price people were in food lines because they wanted to say: I am in a food line? No, sir. They were there because they were not making enough in the Washington metropolitan area and in other areas around the country, because less than 20 percent of the Federal employees live in this Washington metropolitan area.

The pay freeze President Trump imposed on Federal workers has been detrimental to our ability as a nation to recruit and retain the best and brightest citizens to serve in government.

Now, very frankly, Abe Pollin, a very good friend of mine, owned the Washington Wizards. He never asked me to play center because I have a disability. I am 6-feet tall, not 7-feet tall. That is all. And the people he asked, he had to pay a lot of money to them because he wouldn't get them if he didn't.

The people who were running our space program, or running NIH, they are just not run-of-the-mill people, frankly, like me. They have got extraordinary skills. If we keep shutting them down and we keep not paying them, you are going to have a second-rate government. That is where you are going.

You are going to have another opportunity to say shutdown is stupid. I hope you join us on that because it is stupid. It cost us \$11 billion according

to CBO. After 5 weeks of an unnecessary, costly, and painful shutdown, the American people have been reminded how critical the work our Federal employees perform is to our national security and economic security.

Americans were horrified to learn that many civilian Federal employees live paycheck to paycheck, as they do. Even a single month's delay of income sent many of them to food pantries and in search of emergency loans.

That isn't right. We had, for a long time, an agreement. We do parity for our military personnel. Now we pay our military, who we put at the point of the spear, hazardous duty pay, as we should. But our agreement was we are going to make sure that everybody keeps their pay at pretty much a stable level of purchasing power. That is the key.

Very frankly, some people in this House are not for raising the minimum wage. The minimum wage has eroded 40 percent in purchasing power since 1968. The Federal employee pay will erode in purchasing power if we don't pass this legislation.

Let's not forget that 85 percent of Federal employees live outside the Washington area in some of your districts; even in North Carolina.

Those who work hard to keep our country and its people safe deserve to be paid competitively. This does not bring them to competitive pay with the private sector, I tell my friends.

I am proud to represent, as I said, 62,000 of them. I have met many of them over the years. They are wonderful people dedicated to serving the Nation and the people of our country. They deserve better than to be treated like pawns in political games with shutdowns and pay freezes.

Now, the Senate included 1.9 percent. We included zero over here, of course, not surprising. When you don't respect people, you don't necessarily have to treat them as you would treat an employee in your own firm.

Federal civilian employees, unlike their counterparts in the military, have been asked to contribute \$182 billion over the last 10 years in reduced benefits and pay. \$182 billion they have contributed to try to bring down our debt, which is sort of a drop in the bucket when you give yourself \$1.5 trillion for some of the wealthiest people in America.

You give yourself headroom to create \$1.5 trillion to \$2.5 trillion of additional debt to give some of the wealthiest people in America a huge tax cut, but not 2.6 percent for Federal employees. My no.

That scientist at NASA or the FBI agent who has maybe a college degree, maybe a law degree, who has to figure out what some of the most dangerous people in America and around the world are doing, no, not 2.6 percent for them.

Mr. Chair, we need to make sure pay is keeping pace with the rising cost of living for those who serve this country

in civilian roles, as well as those in military roles. They are no less deserving of our gratitude and fair compensation. This bill would ensure that civilian Federal employees receive the same 2.6 percent that all of you voted for on that side of the aisle for our military personnel.

I honor our military personnel. We should give them that. We should make sure their purchasing power doesn't erode. And by the way, you can talk to military families who also from time to time are in food lines. Is that the right way to treat our people who work for our country and our constituents?

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in supporting this bill. In doing so, we can show the hard-working men and women—unlike we showed them for 35 days—that we do have respect for them; that we do care about their morale; and that we do care about their ability to support themselves and their families. We can show them that we value their contributions and thank them for their important service.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues, at a time of extraordinary trauma among our Federal employees, to show them the gratitude and respect that they have earned and that they deserve.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I am glad the Chairman made this admonishment because some of the comments that were just offered actually seemed to be directed at me from a standpoint of respect. I would remind the gentleman from Maryland, both gentlemen from Maryland, that this is one of the individuals who has actually worked in a bipartisan fashion on TPS and a number of things. The majority leader knows that well.

I would also say if we are going to make broad-sweeping statements that impugn the motives of individuals, it needs to start with the previous President of the United States, Barack Obama, because he froze the Federal workforce at zero three different times.

I didn't hear the outrage on this floor, Mr. Chairman, that I am hearing today. It is somehow always one side of the aisle's fault, unless it happens to be their party's President that invokes the freeze.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, we need to make sure that those broad-brush characterizations are not conveyed here on the House floor.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on the point he just made?

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I respectfully yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much because he makes a good point. When President Obama became President, of course, we were in a deep trough as the gentleman remembers.

□ 1115

It was January of 2009, and we sat around the Cabinet table. I was the majority leader then as well, and I said:

Federal employees ought to get no cost-of-living adjustment, Mr. President. The country is in a deep trough. Many people are hurting in this country, and we should not have a COLA adjustment this year.

I supported the second year of not having a COLA adjustment because we were still in a problem. Mr. Chairman, you will not find any record of my standing on this floor saying that we ought to give Federal employees a COLA while so many people in the country were struggling without a job and losing their homes. So I just wanted to tell the gentleman that when a Democrat was President of the United States, I told the Federal unions—all of whom supported me—Look, the country is in trouble.

But we are not in trouble now. The President talks about what a great economy we have and what low unemployment we have. So now is the time to give them that raise.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MEADOWS. I appreciate the gentleman, but I want to make sure, Mr. Chairman, we correct the record because the gentleman is correct in 2009 and 2010. But we gave them raises in 2010. The Federal pay freezes were 2011, '12, and '13 when the same President was saying that everything was going fine. So I want to remind the gentleman that if we are going to look at history, then I think—to use the gentleman's words—let's not use revisionist history.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't support him, however, when he did those zeros in those years when we were doing well.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct it to you. The same gentleman who is making the argument here today was not on the House floor talking about how evil the President was and how he should not be doing that. So I just want to make sure we correct the record here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the majority leader. In his comments he said that the shutdown is painful and stupid.

No one wants a shutdown, Mr. Chairman, but I will tell you what is stupid. What is stupid is a southern border that is not secure. I feel for the Federal employees who missed a paycheck. We don't want any family to have to go through that, and I understand that.

But I also understand the pain that some families across this country have suffered, particularly when they lose a loved one because an illegal immigrant is here and took the life of someone they cared deeply about.

This shutdown would have never happened if the Democrats would have voted for what they were for before, what they had already supported. But

no, no, no, they are so focused on stopping the President that they can't get focused on helping the country.

Everybody knows we need a border security wall. All you have to do, Mr. Chairman, is watch the caravan phenomena over the last several months. There is another one forming. Until we understand this and are willing to deal with the problem, we can keep having these debates, but I just wish Democrats would support what they did previously, support money for the border security wall that everybody knows needs to happen. That is the real problem here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Let me make it clear, Mr. Chairman: this is not about a border wall. This is about building people and allowing them to sustain themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who is the very distinguished leader of our caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on behalf of the hardworking Federal employees who serve this Nation in such a tremendous fashion.

I rise today in strong support of this legislation which will provide a modest and well-deserved cost-of-living increase for the Federal workforce.

For 35 days, this administration recklessly shut down the government so it could try to fund a campaign applause line. For 35 days, this administration shut down the government and held hardworking employees hostage using them like bargaining chips from a bankrupt casino. For 35 days, hundreds of thousands of Federal employees were furloughed, putting their well-being in jeopardy.

For 35 days, members of the Coast Guard, air traffic controllers, TSA agents, FBI agents, Border Patrol agents, Secret Service agents, and so many others were forced to work without pay in the wealthiest country in the history of the world. For 35 days, these hardworking Federal employees across the country from north to south to east to west stepped up for us. Now it is time for this Congress to step up for them.

Over the last 2 years, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent their time working on behalf of the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected. That is the only way, Mr. Chairman, that you can explain jamming a reckless tax scam down the throats of the American people where 83 percent of the benefits went to the wealthiest 1 percent.

House Democrats will spend our time fighting for working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, and veterans from all across this country, many of whom, by the way, are part of the Fed-

eral workforce. We are going to continue to stand up for them.

We promised the American people that we would increase pay for everyday Americans. Keeping that promise begins today. Day after day, week after week, and month after month we will continue to do everything possible as we fight hard for the people.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I thank the distinguished chair and this wonderful committee for their great work.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CÁRDENAS). The gentleman from North Carolina has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, before I make some statements, I would notify the gentleman from Maryland, my good friend, Mr. CUMMINGS, that I have no additional speakers on this particular topic, so I am prepared to close at any time he would like to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time based on the speakers the gentleman might have.

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

Let me say this, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday we had our organizational meeting, and I made it clear that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has been truly a person who has worked very hard in a bipartisan way trying to come up with commonsense resolutions. So in no way do I want the gentleman to feel as if that is not being recognized, and we appreciate it.

It is just that we have a lot of employees who aren't making those very high salaries. They are the ones who are living from paycheck to paycheck.

Mr. Chairman, one of the saddest parts is when they go from paycheck to paycheck it is almost like no check because when they look at their bills, the bills are so much higher than their net pay. All we are trying to do is make sure that they keep up with the cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who is the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I do agree that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) has tried mightily to work with us on various issues. He is not a bad man, he is just wrong on this one issue, in my opinion.

First of all, I rise in support of this very, very modest cost-of-living increase for Federal workers.

My wife has a habit of reminding me from time to time. She says: When we

first met, you were an ironworker. Then you went to law school and became a lawyer. Then you ran for office and became a politician. You know, it has been one disappointment after another.

But I want to say, as an ironworker I was in a much better position than our Federal workers. When I was an ironworker—and I eventually became president of the union—if my job was unsafe or if the employer refused to pay my workers, as a union president, I would pull my men and women off the job. Under Taft-Hartley 1947, we changed that law for Federal workers, everybody in the Federal Government. We said, ironically, that these jobs are so important that we can't have the government shut down. We can't have the government shut down.

So even though we have a President now in the White House who not only shut the job down, forced the workers to work without pay, and then—that was on the 22nd of December—on the 28th of December he signs an executive order that says no pay increase for all of 2019 for our Federal workers.

I want to point out that the TSA workers—whom we walk by at least twice a week as we come and go from Washington—their base starting salary is \$28,000 a year—\$28,000 a year. I made more money than that when I was an apprentice boy for the ironworkers back in 1972—\$28,000 a year. This would represent a \$27-a-week cost-of-living adjustment for those workers.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LYNCH. In Taft-Hartley we said that as a government we were taking away the right of workers to strike. As an ironworker, I put my tools down if I thought it was unsafe or if somebody cut my pay. We don't allow Federal workers to do that.

I am saying that this President has broken that covenant of treating our workers with respect. I think it is only fair that we consider giving back the right to strike to our Federal workers. Let them stand up for themselves and protest like we give every other human being in our society. Give them the right to protest. Give them the right to strike if we are not going to treat them right.

I think that, unfortunately, we have come to this point. I certainly want to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very modest cost-of-living adjustment on behalf of our Federal workers.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the new chairman of our committee, for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this tiny—I will call it modest—2.6 percent pay raise authorized by H.R. 790 does not begin to make up for the long overdue pay raise our

Federal workers are due. It does not begin to make up for the puny raises—sometimes as low as 1 percent, sometimes no raise at all—that our Federal workers have had to bear, and it certainly does not make up for 35 days of no pay for the longest shutdown in American history.

It is particularly unconscionable to follow the Trump shutdown with a Trump pay freeze. Every Member in this House represents Federal workers. Every Member should be on the floor speaking for them.

For years, Congress recognized pay increase equity between civilian and military personnel. But perhaps with the disparagement of Federal workers by Republicans and Republican Presidents, and perhaps to save money, we no longer even try to bring together these two parts of our workforce. It is hard to justify bifurcation of the civilian from the military workforce today.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from the District of Columbia an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. For example, what about the many who work side by side such as the civil servants who guard our borders who are hardly different from the soldiers who do the same thing around the country?

The 2.6 percent pay raise proposed here does not begin to make up for the 32 percent average difference between Federal and private-sector employees who do the same work according to the council that measures this work every year. But for now, after 35 days of no pay, now is the time to try to insinuate some fairness into pay for Federal workers with this modest 2 percent pay raise.

□ 1130

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

We hear a lot of discussion today on what is reasonable and small amounts. In fact, the pay raise that they are talking about is about \$5.5 billion a year or \$55 billion over 10. Actually, CBO would probably score it higher than that, closer to \$60 billion over 10 years. Yet this whole shutdown that we are talking about could have been solved with a compromise between zero and \$5.7 billion for a wall.

So it was an extreme amount of money when we are talking about securing families, securing our borders, and protecting our communities. It was a price too high to pay. But now, all of a sudden, it is not too high of a price to pay because it is a small amount of money? I fail to see the logic, Mr. Chairman.

When we are looking at this, if we are really talking about compromises, where was the compromise over the last 35 days? There was zero money for a wall on day one. There was zero money for a wall on day 35. Yet, here

today, we are talking about \$5 billion or \$6 billion as if it were pocket change.

I find that interesting, Mr. Chairman, because, as we look at this particular issue, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would have the American people think that it is only the Republicans who are totally responsible for everything. Yet we know that history shows that, when there was a Democrat in the White House, indeed, there was a pay freeze 3 different years.

We also know that there were two votes during the economic and financial meltdown in 2008 and 2009 where they gave Federal workers a 3 percent increase while everybody else was out looking for a job. Now, where is the parity in that?

The last question I would have for you, Mr. Chairman, is this: Where is the parity, when we look at our military men and women's faces, when we start talking about 2.6, that they are getting the same amount? They are not getting the same amount. Talk to a chief master sergeant who has been on the job for 15 years. He is getting far less pay than the Federal worker who is getting this same increase when you have over 25 percent of the Federal workforce making over \$100,000 a year.

We hear all these statistics that are low statistics, but let's at least be honest in our debate. When we look at what we have, if this is a small amount of money, I guess I would challenge my colleagues on the opposite side: Let's find a compromise on border security measures.

What amount of money is proper to save families from losing loved ones? I have looked in the faces of angel moms and angel dads, where they have lost their kids. Are we going to just turn our back on them as well?

Perhaps there is a spirit of compromise here where we can work together and find a compromise where there are no more shutdowns. Let's look at passing a bill that freezes congressional pay if there is a shutdown. I am all in. Are all the Democrats in? Let's look at it, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Today we are zeroing in on Federal workers whose average pay is \$60,000. We are zeroing in on folks who are, in many instances, barely making it.

I don't want us to get it twisted. We have a situation where a lot of times we discuss a whole lot of other things but don't necessarily concentrate on the subject matter at hand.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, in our committee, we had a lady who came in and told us that her daughter died. She died because she couldn't get \$333 worth of insulin a month. That happened in America.

What is my point? These dollars mean a lot to these Federal employees.

I am not going to pit our military against our civilian employees. They are all very important. I want them all to be well paid. But right now, we need to concentrate on, again, building people and making a difference in their lives.

Speaking of building people, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON), a cosponsor of this bill.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, GERRY CONNOLLY, for his strong leadership on this issue.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 790 and in strong support of a long-overdue cost-of-living increase for Federal civil servants.

Many will remember the President's callous executive order of December 30, right in the middle of the shutdown, freezing Federal workers' salaries while hundreds of thousands of them were furloughed or, worse, working without pay.

Federal employees are not the swamp, as some would have you believe. Federal employees are the people who make sure that Social Security checks are mailed on time each month. They are the scientists researching cures for cancer. They are tour guides in our national parks. They are FBI agents investigating criminal activity. They are the air traffic controllers and TSA agents keeping us safe when we fly.

We saw during the shutdown how important every dollar of every paycheck is for Federal employees to pay their bills, to pay their rent, to pay their mortgage, to afford childcare, to pay off their student loans, and, yes, even to feed their families.

It is time to give Federal employees the pay raise and the respect they deserve, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me close by saying a sincere word of compliment to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

We have great differences on this piece of legislation, and, indeed, we represent very different districts. It has been said many times that you can disagree without being disagreeable, and I want to compliment the two gentlemen for their vigorous debate today yet where they didn't make personal attacks. I hope that, Mr. Chairman, they have seen the same from me, and I have high respect for both of them.

I also believe that, at times, where perhaps we deescalate the emotions—and I know this is a highly charged, emotional debate, as it should be—we can find common ground.

Mr. Chairman, I commit to the two gentlemen with whom I have had the privilege of working for the last 6 years that I will continue to work hard and

with great resolve to find ways that we can not only recognize and compensate our Federal workers, but we can do so in a manner that is fair and equitable and certainly makes sure that the servants they are are recognized.

Mr. Chairman, I would also say that this particular piece of legislation, hopefully, will provide the fodder for us going back to the committee and going through a markup process to look at how we actually address this, where we actually have hearings and bring in experts, because, Mr. Chairman, we have had the majority leader of the Congress on this House floor citing one particular survey and we have had me here citing the CBO, and those two statistics are at odds. So I think it is important that we hear from real experts and figure out how we do this.

The time is now for us to find a way to work in a bipartisan manner to truly move this country forward. The Federal workforce is an important part of that.

I believe this particular piece of legislation sends a bad message to those Federal workers who believe that pay raises are not based on merit, that they don't identify the poor performers. We have to address that as well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chair, I insert in the RECORD an article from The Washington Post that reports the Federal Salary Council, the official monitor of Federal pay, found that Federal workers make an average of 30 percent less than their private-sector counterparts.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 2018]

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SALARIES LAG BY AVERAGE OF 31 PERCENT, PAY GROUP REPORTS
(By Eric Yoder)

Federal employee salaries on average lag behind those of the private sector by almost 31 percent, an advisory council said Tuesday, while splitting between union and non-union members on whether to recommend potential changes in the way it arrives at that figure.

The average salary difference of 30.91 percent reported by the Federal Salary Council is somewhat smaller than the 31.86 percent it reported at a special meeting it held April. The figures of prior years were in the 34 to 35 percent range.

Those figures, based on two Labor Department surveys covering some 250 occupations, stand in contrast to assessments of some conservative and libertarian organizations that have concluded that the advantage is about the same or even greater in favor of federal employees.

The Congressional Budget Office last year essentially split the difference. It found an average advantage for federal workers of 3 percent, although within that average it said there is a wide range by educational level: from a 34 percent advantage for federal

workers with a high school education or less to a 24 percent shortfall for those with a professional degree or doctorate.

Under a federal pay law, the "pay gap" as measured by the Salary Council is to be used in setting annual raises varying by locality for federal employees under the General Schedule, the pay system covering most white-collar employees below the executive levels. However, that law never has been followed due to the potential cost of paying such large raises and disagreements over how the figure is calculated.

In an August message to Congress, President Trump said that following the law's formula would result in locality-based raises in January 2019 averaging 25.7 percent plus an across-the-board raise of 2.1 percent, at a cost of \$25 billion. "Federal agency budgets cannot sustain such increases," Trump's said in backing a pay freeze that he originally proposed in a budget plan early this year.

A House-Senate conference underway on a spending bill will decide between a freeze and a Senate provision to pay an average 1.9 percent raise. Unless Congress passes, and Trump signs, a bill specifying a raise, salaries will be frozen by default. If the raise is enacted, it would vary slightly among 44 city areas and what is called the "rest of the U.S." locality everywhere else; employees working in the Washington-Baltimore area would stand to receive one of the larger raises, probably around 2.3 percent.

The long-running controversy over comparing salaries flared at Tuesday's meeting of the Salary Council, a group of federal employee unions and compensation experts whose decisions typically are unanimous.

A "working group" document produced since the April meeting laid out a series of potential changes for consideration by a higher-level body called the President's Pay Agent. Those options included adding more detailed data on salaries by occupation and level of work, taking into account other data such as attrition rates, switching to a "total compensation" approach taking benefits into account, and conducting a very detailed review only once every four or five years—the latter two of which would require a change in law.

Council chairman Ron Sanders, a longtime career federal personnel official who is now a clinical professor at the University of South Florida School of Public Affairs, argued in favor of exploring those options. "I think it's obvious to all of us that the current methodology is problematic," he said.

"That methodology does not tell the whole story," Sanders said. "It's nice to say there's a 30 percent gap. If OMB [the Office of Management and Budget] doesn't believe it, the White House doesn't believe it, the Congress doesn't believe it, what good does it do?"

He pointed to the testimony of officials of federal agencies from several urban and rural areas not now receiving higher city-based locality pay, who told of their difficulties in recruiting and retaining employees despite using special hiring authorities and incentive payments. However, the current process doesn't support specific salary rates for them, he said.

Two other members supported exploring the options: Katja Bullock, associate director of presidential personnel, and Jill Nelson, who leads an advisory committee on pay for blue-collar federal employees.

However, members from federal unions argued against changing the calculations and questioned whether the group even has the authority to raise new options for consideration. "I don't think the methodology is broken," said J. David Cox Sr., president of the American Federation of Government Employees.

"The elephant in the room is the Congress and the president over time not funding the

pay system” as the law intended, said Randy L. Erwin, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. Anthony M. Reardon, president of the National Treasury Employees Union, expressed concern that including the value of federal benefits “will be used as a justification to reduce those benefits.”

The council adjourned without voting on whether to recommend that the Pay Agent consider different approaches. Afterward, Sanders said that in the annual report to that higher-level body to be made by year’s end, individual members of the Salary Council could express their own opinions.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, it is so important that we do everything in our power to support our Federal employees, and I want to thank Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. HOYER. They have given their blood and their sweat and their tears for Federal employees: constantly standing up for them, trying to make sure that they are treated fairly and given their due.

Just today, I spoke to two people who were telling me about how Federal employees at NIH basically saved their lives—saved their lives. One told me that the person who saved their life was making about \$65,000. This is a doctor. Come on now. And the other said it was about, maybe, \$70,000 at best.

These are people who could have been doing other things, could have been making a lot of money, but they decided to give their efforts to a greater cause.

Their names will probably never appear on the front page—or any page—of *The Washington Post*. They won’t be on ABC News. They will not have the mansion that they could have gotten, but they have done something that will have fed their souls. They have come to the job with passion, compassion, and the desire to make things better, and they are the ones who have determined that they want to put their fingerprints on the future of generations yet unborn.

Then there are the others, like the TSA workers—you know the ones—earning \$28,000 a year and coming to work, by the way, during the shutdown when they couldn’t even afford the gas to get there. What about them?

So we can make example after example after example, but one thing is for sure, and that is that they are working hard and they deserve our utmost support.

Now, if any message is going to be sent today, I pray, Mr. Chair, that that message goes to our Federal employees that we care about them and that they are not unseen, unnoticed, unappreciated, and unapplauded. No.

I hope the message goes out that we are upholding them and we realize that it is just not about them. We realize, when they don’t get their raise, their family doesn’t get their raise. When they don’t get their raise, maybe that little girl they wanted to send to ballet lessons can’t get them. We get that.

Or maybe that little vacation that they wanted to take, they can’t get that. They are not trying to get to Dis-

ney World. They are just trying to get to the nearest amusement park with some tuna fish and crackers.

□ 1145

Come on now. And that is what this is all about. We can talk about fences all we want.

Right now, we are talking about the building of people and making their lives the best that they can be. We only have one life to live. This is no dress rehearsal, and this is that life.

I applaud the gentleman from North Carolina. I know his heart is right, but right now, I want to concentrate on those folks, the ones like people who live on my block, who get up at 5 in the morning, catch the early bus to get to Social Security and places, and trying to serve the public. I am talking about them.

Mr. Chair, I pray and I ask the Members to vote in favor of this great legislation.

I thank Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. WEXTON, and all of our cosponsors, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

Our federal civilian workforce, who continued to work without pay through a record-long 35-day shutdown, deserves to be fairly compensated for their dedication to our country.

Often unnoticed, this group includes TSA agents who ensure our airports and air travel is safe, the FBI, which actively combats terrorism, and CBP agents, who diligently protect our borders. These heroic employees deserve to see their salary reflect the important and selfless work they do on behalf of the United States.

The civilian federal workforce also includes FDA personnel who ensure the food we eat is safe, National Park rangers who patrol and maintain our beautiful national parks, and IRS employees who work tirelessly to process and distribute tax refunds to Americans all over this country.

Mr. Chair, these federal workers dedicate their lives to serving the American people and this great nation—it is about time we return the favor by ensuring they are fairly compensated for their hard work.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

On December 28, 2018, one week into the longest government shutdown in history, President Trump added insult to injury by announcing that all federal civilian workers would not receive a pay raise in 2019.

This action continues the years of menial pay raises that federal employees have received.

Federal employees have endured pay freezes, hiring freezes, higher pension contributions, and furloughs as a result of sequestration and government shutdowns, including the longest shutdown in our nation’s history.

Texas has over 270,000 federal employees. Almost 4,000 of those federal employees call my district, Texas 18, home.

It is time that Congress act and shows its appreciation for these and the almost 2 million

other men and women who are federal employees and the services they provide to our great nation.

Denying these federal workers a hard-earned raise is not the way to balance the budget.

Providing these workers with a raise is not an unrealistic burden on the federal budget.

The cost of a pay raise would be approximately \$25 billion.

Trump’s tax reform bill cost over 10 times this amount.

It is inappropriate for the President to use these civil servants as a bargaining chip, and it is inappropriate to not recognize their hard work and dedication through a much earned pay raise.

For too long, federal employees have been the victims of attacks being told that “good people don’t go into government,” that the federal government is full of “waste, fraud, and abuse.”

This is categorically false.

Federal employees have contributed nearly \$200 billion to deficit reduction and other government programs over the past several years.

These attacks on federal employees are in addition to the Republican attacks on federal worker pay and benefits that have been happening for years.

We need to help the morale of the federal workforce.

We need to make the federal government competitive with the private sector so that highly qualified candidates are able to serve the American people.

We need to retain the talent that we have.

It is time for Congress to show their support for the men and women who work selflessly and tirelessly for our government with this modest pay raise.

H.R. 790 would authorize a 2.6 percent pay raise for federal civilian workers and established pay parity between them and military service members for 2019, a longstanding Congressional tradition.

Federal workers who would receive this pay raise are employees in the competitive and excepted services; prevailing wage or blue collar workers; members of the career Senior Executive Service; and employees in the scientific and senior level positions.

This modest pay increase, between \$488.41–\$4,041.54 a year, would help offset the cost of inflation and to make up for years of freezes and negligible increases.

I am a strong supporter of the men and women who make up the federal civilian workforce, and I ask my colleagues to show their support to these integral federal employees by joining me in supporting H.R. 790.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act.

Our federal public servants dedicate their lives to serving their fellow Americans.

Today, let’s thank them for their dedicated service to our country by providing them and their families an overdue pay raise that they have earned.

The Trump shutdown exposed the all-too-real economic reality for many Americans. Millions live paycheck-to-paycheck, including many of our public servants. They did not choose a life of public service to make it rich, but rather to serve and improve the lives of their fellow citizens.

The shutdown also crystalized the daily impact federal workers have on all our lives. 85 percent of all federal workers live outside of Washington, and their paychecks drive the economies of communities across the U.S.

This increase of 2.6 percent will help federal workers, 1 in 8 of whom make less than \$40,000 a year, make ends meet while stimulating local small businesses across the nation when federal employees spend their earnings.

Mr. Chair, it is unacceptable that their pay has not reflected the increased demands of cost of living for years. It's time we give our hardworking federal employees the pay raise they deserve and earn every day.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-5 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 790

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. PAY INCREASE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN 2019.

(a) **STATUTORY PAY SYSTEMS.**—For calendar year 2019, the percentage adjustment under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of basic pay under the statutory pay systems (as defined in section 5302 of such title) shall be 2.6 percent.

(b) **PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES.**—Notwithstanding the wage survey requirements under section 5343(b) of title 5, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019, the rates of basic pay (as in effect on the last day of fiscal year 2018 under section 5343(a) of such title) for prevailing rate employees in each wage area and the rates of basic pay under sections 5348 and 5349 of such title shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

(c) **SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE CAREER APPOINTEES.**—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay for any career position within the Senior Executive Service or the FBI-DEA Senior Executive Service (as that term is defined in section 3151(a) of title 5, United States Code) shall be the rate of pay for any such position on December 31, 2018, increased by 2.6 percent.

(d) **SENIOR-LEVEL AND SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS.**—For calendar year 2019, the rates of basic pay for any senior-level and scientific and professional position under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code, shall be the rate of pay for any such position on December 31, 2018, increased by 2.6 percent.

(e) **EXCEPTED SERVICE.**—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay for any position in the excepted service (as that term is defined by section 2103 of title 5, United States Code) shall be the rate of pay for any such position on December 31, 2018, increased by 2.6 percent.

(f) **APPLICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The adjustments in pay made under this Act shall apply beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS PERMITTED; LIMITS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(A) limit any other increase, including allowances, performance awards, or bonuses,

otherwise permitted under law to any a rate of pay adjusted under this Act; or

(B) waive any provision of law, rule, or regulation, including section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, limiting total aggregate pay.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-5. 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 amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-5.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 2(e) the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(f) **SECRET SERVICE EMPLOYEES.**—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay of any employee of the United States Secret Service provided under chapter 102 of title 5, United States Code, who did not receive a pay increase by operation of subsections (a) through (e) shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of this amendment, which would guarantee the United States Secret Service receive a 2.6 percent pay increase with the rest of the civilian workforce.

The underlying bill will nullify the President's executive order that froze pay for Federal workers. It is important we include all employees of the Secret Service in that correction.

The Secret Service's most well-known mission is to spend every day protecting the President of the United States. That is why it is unfortunate. First, he froze their pay, and then he didn't pay them for 35 days in the longest government shutdown in history.

I represent a district right outside of Washington, D.C., and a lot of my friends and fellow constituents are Federal workers. I was disheartened to learn in December they would not be receiving a pay increase. They go to work every day to serve our country. They are American workers; they are patriots; they are friends; and they deserve better.

This amendment will ensure that no Secret Service employees are inadvertently left out of a much-needed pay raise. They work every day to protect

the President and the Vice President from harm and protect against crimes of our Nation's financial and banking infrastructure, and they deserve recognition, and they deserve a raise.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment suffers some of the same defects as the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, while there are numerous dedicated civil servants in all parts of the Federal Government, offering an additional across-the-board pay raise is simply not good policy. It rewards the bad along with the good.

The United States Secret Service is made up of many brave men and women, very honorable men and women. However, in 2015, the bipartisan report issued jointly by then-Chairman Chaffetz and the new chairman of Oversight and Reform, then-Ranking Member CUMMINGS of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, detailed significant personnel problems. The report describes "an extraordinarily inefficient hiring process which overburdens the USSS with low-quality applications."

So the men and women of the uniformed division render critical services to our government. Many of them are friends. And, truly, as we see their dedication, they have to sacrifice so much. Whether it is at the Vice President's residence or whether it is on the complex just a few blocks from here, there is no margin for failure with respect to their protective mission, and I acknowledge that.

However, an across-the-board pay increase does exactly that. It rewards the good along with the bad. That is why we have to have, indeed, a merit-based system that truly recognizes the great performers—the vast majority of whom are great performance—but does not recognize and reward those who are not doing it. We need to do that. And for that reason, I would reject this particular amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this is just a clarifying amendment.

The Secret Service has pay authority for certain positions. We want to be sure that none of those positions are inadvertently left out of this underlying bill. In short, the amendment guarantees all Secret Service employees are treated the same—fair and simple.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, to rehash all the reasons, both good and bad, I am willing to work in a bipartisan way with the chairman of both the committee and the subcommittee to try to find ways to address this issue. This amendment does not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Maryland for his leadership on this amendment, which I support.

The Secret Service do put themselves on the line, and the studies my friend from North Carolina cited had to do with bad management and bad working conditions that really affect morale and productivity at the Secret Service. The gentleman’s amendment is designed to try to help that situation.

The idea that an across-the-board cost of living increase doesn’t distinguish between productivity and non-productivity, performance or non-performance, would also apply to the military.

My friend has no objection to an across-the-board increase for the military, but apparently on the civilian side, that is different. We are making the opposite argument. We are making the argument that pay parity is the right thing to do, especially after this reckless shutdown.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my friend from Maryland on his amendment, and I support it.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. FLETCHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116–5.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk and ask for its consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 2(e) the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(f) NASA EMPLOYEES.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay of any employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided under chapter 98 of title 5, United States Code, who did not receive a pay increase by operation of subsections (a) through (e) shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to ensure that the pay raises are equally distributed to all Federal employees at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In the Houston area that I represent, there are more than 3,000 Federal civil servants who do important work at the Johnson Space Center. While most of these employees work under the traditional GS pay scale and would be covered by the base pay scale adjustment, there are certain employees who would not.

NASA, like many technical agencies, can authorize certain pay flexibilities under different chapters of the code to recruit talented individuals. My amendment merely clarifies that these employees are equally deserving of this pay raise.

After the shutdown, it is now more important than ever to work to retain talented civil service employees around our country, especially at NASA.

I would like to thank my colleagues for working with me on this amendment and urge their support to ensure that the hardworking civil servants get the pay raise that they deserve.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to keep my remarks brief as we have got a number of different amendments going through.

I acknowledge the gentlewoman’s tenacity and her willingness to offer this. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, though, this particular across-the-board pay raise, it really shouldn’t apply to the very individuals that she is talking about because they have flexibility already. We know that. I mean, they get different pay raises.

That is not to undermine the wonderful work that they do. I have been privileged to be able to talk to NASA folks from here in Washington, DC, to her home district in the great State of Texas and across this country. Remarkably, they are one of the best run agencies—and I say that under the previous NASA Administrator and under the current NASA Administrator.

So it is not to not acknowledge their good work, but the whole premise of being able to give them a bump, there is already great pushback among some Federal workers about the flexibility of those individuals and the way that they get their pay raises. There are claims of unfairness. So I think that this sends a wrong message.

Mr. Chair, I urge the rejection of this particular amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that the purpose of this amendment isn’t to address the

underlying issues that the gentleman from North Carolina raised, but it is really to just ensure that the language of this amendment may be applied equally and that no one at NASA is left behind because of differences in the way that their compensation structure is currently scheduled. This is a clarifying amendment, and it is just dedicated to the purpose of making sure that these employees may be included and not excluded from this act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116–5.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 2(e) the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(f) IRS EMPLOYEES.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay of any employee of the Internal Revenue Service provided under chapter 95 of title 5, United States Code, who did not receive a pay increase by operation of subsections (a) through (e) shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

□ 1200

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

I want to commend the sponsors of this important bill that rewards the talent and commitment of our civilian workforce by granting them a 2.6 percent pay adjustment for 2019.

Mr. Chairman, the shutdown was a stark reminder of how crucial these workers are to protect our air and water, secure our shores, guide air traffic, and ensure that our tax returns are processed on time.

I heard desperate stories from many of these public servants, including workers at the IRS processing center in Andover. One of my constituents who works there wrote the following to me during the shutdown: “Apart from selling everything I own to pay for food, bills, and the mortgage, I honestly don’t know what to do and am truly scared that this may do me in.”

Mr. Chairman, this was an entirely avoidable tragedy that wreaked havoc on thousands of lives; yet he and thousands of others like him dutifully reported to work without any certainty of when or whether they would be paid next. The underlying bill is the least we can do for them and the dedicated

public servants like them. My amendment is a simple clarification that all IRS employees would be eligible for this pay adjustment.

We learned yesterday from legislative counsel that the bill could inadvertently exclude some of these employees hired under special provisions of chapter 95, title 5.

For example, title 5, section 9503 grants IRS special authority to hire employees for critical administrative, technical, and professional positions necessary to carry out the functions of the IRS. However, it is unclear whether such individuals would benefit from H.R. 790's pay adjustment. This amendment simply removes any doubt.

I hope that the amendment can be adopted.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I would highlight one thing.

We are going through all these amendments that are clarifying and technical amendments and all of that. That could have all been avoided if we had just had a hearing and had a mark-up and we had gone through it, and yet here we are today on the House floor trying to make amendments to a bill that, candidly, is missing the mark.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most ridiculous amendments I have ever seen.

Just a few years ago, the IRS targeted people for their political beliefs, systematically, for a sustained period of time, went after conservatives because they didn't like their political beliefs and what they were doing.

Now we are saying to those same people across this country—we had constituents. Congressman MEADOWS had constituents. The gentleman from Massachusetts may have constituents. We are now saying to them: Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, you may have been targeted by the IRS, but now we are going to take some of your hard-earned tax money and pay them, give them a pay raise?

Giving people a pay raise who went after people's most fundamental right, your right to speak out against—your First Amendment liberties, that is what this amendment would do.

Also, the chairman knows this. We did an investigation in the Oversight Committee. The IRS had fired people who they then rehired—now think about this—and some of the people they rehired, who had been fired, some of the very people they rehired were people who didn't pay their taxes, and we are now going to give them a pay raise. You have got to be kidding me.

The very agency that systematically went after people, went after our most

fundamental right, our right, under the First Amendment, to speak out against our government, went after people for doing that because they didn't like their political beliefs, set up this elaborate system, this "Be on the Lookout" list, Lois Lerner, and the whole 9 yards, did that, also the same agency that fired people for not paying their taxes and then rehired them, and now the taxpayers have to give them a pay raise. That is what the Democrats want in this amendment.

This is ridiculous. We should reject this, and we should reject, as we talked about before, the whole darn bill.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, and I congratulate her on this amendment.

I can't believe that the distinguished ranking member of our committee would continue to engage in conspiracy theories that have been, in fact, disproved and, worse, would actually paint the entire 41,000 or more workforce of the IRS with one brush. They are all, apparently, out to get us.

You would never know these are hardworking public servants who serve their country nobly and often under very difficult circumstances, because they are hardly the most popular agency in town.

Of course they deserve a pay raise. They were affected by the shutdown. Many of them were called back by the Trump administration to come back without pay because certain industries needed paper being processed. They did it because they are noble public servants and they are patriots, as the distinguished chairman of our committee indicated.

So instead of slandering public servants, we want to honor them.

You are right. We are proud of this amendment, and it is anything but the most ridiculous to come to the floor. It is a very important amendment. I support it.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not painting with a broad brush. Look, I know there are lots of good employees there. All I am saying is an agency that did what the IRS did, that rehired people who had been fired, some of them had been fired for not paying their taxes, an agency that went after people for their political beliefs, I just—call me crazy, but you can go ask your average taxpayer: Do you think that agency that did those things, do you think those people need a pay raise?

My guess is most of the constituents I get the privilege of representing in the Fourth District of Ohio would say: Nope, I am not for that.

That is all I am saying, not painting with a broad brush.

All I know is what this agency did. And it is not a conspiracy theory, and the gentleman from Virginia knows it.

The inspector general did a report and said targeting occurred at the Internal Revenue Service. They went after conservative Tea Party conservative groups, and it happened just as sure I am standing here speaking on the House floor, and the gentleman from Virginia knows that to be the case.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that when we look at sending a message, this sends entirely the wrong message. We need to make sure that we reward Federal workers, but we also hold them accountable. I urge rejection of this particular amendment.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the employees I talked to at the IRS are noble. They are hardworking. They are working with the utmost integrity. They have endured cuts to their agency, at times doing jobs that used to require two, sometimes three people to do.

Again, my amendment merely makes a clarifying change to be certain that all of these employees, all IRS workers, receive the benefit of this well-deserved pay adjustment. I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. FLETCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CÁRDENAS, 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. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS ARE DETRIMENTAL TO NATION AND SHOULD NOT OCCUR

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 79) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Government shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 79

Whereas a portion of the United States Government was shut down from December 22, 2018, to January 25, 2019;

Whereas the Senate, on December 19, 2018, unanimously passed legislation to fund Government operations and avert a Government shutdown but that legislation was not enacted;

Whereas the Government shutdown lasted for 35 days, the longest Government shutdown in the history of our country;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations deprived Americans of important services and caused 800,000 Federal workers to go without pay for more than a month, imposing significant financial hardships on those workers and their families;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations detrimentally affected the Federal Government's ability to recruit and retain career public servants;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations put at risk thousands of small businesses with Federal contracts and created severe financial hardship for tens of thousands of employees of Federal contractors;

Whereas the top economic advisor to the President of the United States predicted that the Government shutdown would reduce economic growth by 0.1 percent for each week it lasted;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has estimated the direct effect of the shutdown to have cost our economy \$11,000,000,000 in lost gross domestic product;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations forced Transportation Security Administration screeners and air traffic controllers to work without pay, causing many to be unable to afford to work and thereby putting at risk the safety and well-being of the traveling public, leading to flight delays, and harming airport security operations;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations put the health of all Americans at risk by curtailing and delaying food safety inspections;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations made our Nation less safe by impeding Federal Bureau of Investigation efforts to crack down on child trafficking, violent crime, and terrorism;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations resulted in the shuttering of and, in some cases, damage to, countless national parks, monuments and other public lands;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations furloughed numerous Federal employees at the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), limiting the Federal Government's ability to help communities rebuild after natural disasters;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations resulted in a majority of Environmental Protection Agency employees being furloughed, with negative consequences for public health and the environment, such as halted clean-up work at hundreds of toxic Superfund sites across the country, a cessation in inspection

and enforcement activities, and a stop to new chemical and pesticide safety evaluations and approvals;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations delayed payment of Department of Agriculture loans, operating loan decisions, planting and marketing decisions and much-needed assistance for farmers harmed by retaliatory tariffs imposed on American agricultural exports, prevented the implementation of a new farm bill with critical support for struggling dairy farmers and other operations, and cast damaging uncertainty on the nutrition assistance relied on by millions of vulnerable Americans;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations delayed the issuance of tax refunds to America's hard-working taxpayers;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations penalized small business owners by halting the approval of Small Business Administration loans;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations impeded the operations of United States embassies abroad, undermining the ability of United States personnel to combat terror, enforce sanctions, and strengthen alliances;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations undermined the ability of the Department of Homeland Security to respond to increased cybersecurity threats, natural disasters, and terror threats;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations delayed approval of FHA-backed mortgages, putting Americans at risk of losing the house they were attempting to buy or sell;

Whereas the lapse in appropriations hobbled the ability of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer the Section 8 low-income housing program that allows for HUD to provide affordable rental housing to low-income tenants, including the elderly and disabled;

Whereas Senator Mitch McConnell has called shutdowns "a failed policy";

Whereas Senator Susan Collins said on January 23, 2019, "shutdowns represent the ultimate failure to govern and should never be used as a weapon to achieve an outcome"; and

Whereas Senator Lamar Alexander said on January 24, 2019, "it is always wrong for either side to use shutting down the Government as a bargaining chip in budget negotiations—it should be as off-limits as chemical weapons are to warfare"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the shutdown of the Government of the United States, or any portion thereof, causes substantial damage to Federal employees, to every American who benefits directly or indirectly from Federal services, to our Nation's economy, and to the reputation of the United States around the world;

(2) shutting down the Government of the United States, or any portion thereof, is not an acceptable tactic or strategy for resolving differences regarding policy, funding levels, or governing philosophy; and

(3) in the future the Congress must ensure the continued, uninterrupted operations of the Government of the United States and its services as well as its duty to protect and promote the security of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 79.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am relieved and grateful that the longest government shutdown in our Nation's history has ended. I am sure that many people share these same feelings, including my colleagues. The American people, and especially, the 800,000 Federal employees who were furloughed or forced to work without pay for 35 days, have to be relieved.

I hope that the one positive thing to come out of this experience is universal recognition that government shutdowns are almost always pointless exercises that are harmful to our country and our constituents.

The Federal Government should be open for business and not closed. That is why I strongly support H. Res. 79, the measure before us today.

Even though the recent shutdown affected only part of the Federal Government, its impact was deeply felt throughout the country. The Departments of Homeland Security, State, Treasury, Commerce, Justice, Agriculture, the EPA, and NASA, were shuttered.

Operations at these agencies essentially came to a screeching halt:

Phone calls went unanswered as Federal workers were furloughed;

Safety inspections of industrial sites, factories, and power plants, were halted because EPA inspectors were sent home;

Food inspections at the FDA ceased;

Scientists at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Fish and Wildlife Service were furloughed.

Law enforcement officers at the FBI, DEA, Secret Service, and Customs and Border Protection were the lucky ones. They got to work without pay. These dedicated men and women, many of whom make only \$60,000 a year, missed more than a month's pay.

Just like other middle-class families, Federal employees have bills to pay also: food, mortgages, rent, medical bills, student loans, and car payments. And like so many other Americans, many live paycheck to paycheck.

It is simply cruel to inflict such financial hardship and unnecessary stress on workers who just want to do their jobs serving the American people.

The greatest irony of the last shutdown is that immigration enforcement and border protection suffered as a result, despite the President's fixation on a wall, a brilliant 14th century solution to a 21st century problem.

□ 1215

The shutdown closed the immigration courts, contributing to an already

significant backlog of cases and delays in deportation.

The harm ripples through our economy, touching everyone from Federal employees to Federal contractors, to private sector businesses, and, most importantly, to every American who relies upon the vital services Federal workers provide.

The CBO estimated that the economic cost of the shutdown is \$11 billion—that is \$11 billion—almost twice the cost of the funding the President seeks for his wall.

We must learn from this recent shutdown. We must not let it happen again in a few short weeks. We can and must do better and work together to prevent any future shutdowns, which I am certain my friends and colleagues from North Carolina and Ohio want to do. I am sure they will have a short response to opening statements and will probably join in with us.

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I notice a smirk on your face. We find it laughable as well. But I enjoy the gentleman from Missouri.

Is that the way you say it, the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, Missouri, like it is spelled.

Mr. MEADOWS. Missouri. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoy the humor, but unfortunately, there is nothing funny about this.

I find it just unbelievable that the gentleman opposite would be talking about how important this resolution is. They just dropped it on Monday night. I mean, it hasn't been out there for any length of time. In fact, it violated the very rule that this Chamber passed in the beginning of this Congress, yet somehow this resolution is so unbelievably important.

It is nothing more than a message meant to go after the President of the United States. Quite frankly, I find this resolution nothing more than a political stunt. I am troubled by it, Mr. Speaker, because here we are today arguing over this resolution that could have been dropped—we were here working. It could have been dropped long ago, but the gentlewoman from Virginia drops it just on Monday night of this week.

Maybe they were working on the wording in Puerto Rico when they were down there caravanning with lobbyists, Mr. Speaker, that you know very well.

Maybe when Christmas was here, when the President was in the White House willing to negotiate, they were working and fine-tuning this message to make sure that it is here.

No, that is not what this is about. This is about a political stunt. This is literally a political messaging point meant to garner, hopefully, the support for some Member of Congress who has

a swing district, so that they can send a message and take it.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to let you know that we don't need words. We need compromise.

I take the gentleman from Missouri's word. If we are willing to work together and find a compromise, I think we all would prefer that there is never another shutdown.

In fact, I think that we ought to propose legislation that would suspend congressional pay for every Member of Congress if there is ever another shutdown. Hopefully, my Members opposite would join me in that, where we can put some kind of pain to make sure that we are there.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my friends on the other side will agree it does no one good, it does this country no good, when we shut down government.

I don't know about you, but my friend from North Carolina, I believe he goes through airports sometimes. I will say this: Over the last 5 weeks, it was quite difficult for me to look in the eyes of my constituents who happen to be TSA agents and tell them: "I am sorry, but you are going to miss a payday," or, "You are going to miss another payday."

We are better than that. We are better than that as a Congress, as an institution, and as a government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON), the sponsor of this legislation and my friend.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 79, which is my resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that government shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur.

Mr. Speaker, between December 22 and January 25, more than 800,000 Federal workers went without pay because of the Trump shutdown.

Saying that shutdowns harm the American people and the economy should not be controversial. These facts are not up for debate, or at least they shouldn't be. But yesterday, members of the Freedom Caucus basically tried to shut down the House of Representatives because they objected to a sentence in the resolution that said the President shut down the government to achieve a legislative end.

Now, he did. We all saw him say it on television, and we have seen it many, many times since then. But I am a brand-new legislator, and I am all about getting to "yes" and finding consensus, so the offending clause has been removed from this resolution and should not be a problem anymore.

For 35 days, our workers were forced to go without a paycheck. That is two pay periods that workers had to make

difficult financial decisions for themselves and for their families.

Essential services were halted; national parks were shuttered; and our national security was compromised during this time.

TSA screeners and air traffic controllers were forced to work without pay. FBI offices had to delay indictments against violent criminals.

The CBO estimated the effect of the Trump shutdown to be \$11 billion, with more than a quarter of that amount permanently lost.

The shutdown also impacted our Federal Government's ability to recruit and retain career public servants, with many Federal workers reconsidering their career choices after this shutdown irreparably harmed them.

On December 20, the President announced that he would refuse to sign legislation that had been unanimously passed by the Senate just the day before due to his insistence that Congress provide funding to build a wall along the southern border.

This was not a priority before Democrats took over the House of Representatives, but all of a sudden, it was a crisis. This resulted in the longest government shutdown in American history.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution highlights the substantial burdens that were placed on the American people from the President of the United States attempting to use a government shutdown to get a policy win. Nobody wins when the government shuts down.

My district is home to tens of thousands of Federal workers and government contractors, and the impact of the shutdown was felt in my district almost immediately.

I also have heard from people all over the country who were impacted by the shutdown, including an air traffic controller who told me about the stress that going two pay periods without pay added to what is already one of the most stressful jobs in the Nation.

I heard from a family who had to give up their Christmas entirely and who asked their children to hold their money, because they needed to make sure they had the funds to buy food during the prolonged shutdown.

I heard from the CEO of a small business in my district that relies on Federal contracts with the Federal Government who was worried about how he was going to continue to pay his workers when his invoices from the Federal Government were not being paid.

Meanwhile, the guidance from the administration to workers without paychecks was to suggest they take out loans, have a garage sale, babysit, drive for Uber, become a mystery shopper, or ask their landlord for an extension on their rent.

On January 24, the Secretary of Commerce, Wilbur Ross, made comments on live news expressing confusion about why Federal employees who have been furloughed or are working without pay had to receive assistance at food banks.

These unreasonable suggestions from the administration and the comments from Secretary Ross showed just how out of touch the administration is when it comes to our Federal workers, many of whom do live paycheck to paycheck.

We have an opportunity to make it clear that shutting down the Government of the United States is not an acceptable strategy to resolve policy differences.

Mr. Speaker, after all they have been through, we owe assurances to the millions of Federal civilian workers, including the hundreds of thousands who were furloughed earlier this month, that Congress will ensure continued, uninterrupted operations of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, people at home think they are watching C-SPAN, but this is more like "Masterpiece Theatre." I mean, this is actually like a documentary where we record what happened in history, but here we see that we are going to change and revise history. We are going to remind everybody who is watching and everybody in this House that, under this minority leader, who was the majority leader at the time, we passed a bill in this House to keep the government open.

We didn't want to shut down the government. We wanted to keep the government open and fund border security. We passed it in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I know everybody is smiling over there because you voted against it, but we passed it in this House, and we sent it to the Senate. It was the Senate Democrats who said, "Oh, no. Oh, no, we are not going to do any of that border security stuff. We want you to go ahead and have the shutdown, and then we will blame it all on you."

Mr. Speaker, we are not here to revise history. We would like to get to the task at hand, which is solving this issue of border security.

We ask the other side, instead of engaging in this blame game, of which they are wholly part of, obviously—they didn't want to keep the government open. The Senate Democrats didn't want to do anything to keep the government open. Forget this charade, this theater, and let's get to negotiating on border security and making sure that the American people are safe.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to respond to that last speech.

A bill came from the Senate unanimously, Republicans and Democrats, that would have opened the govern-

ment. We would have voted for that bill, all of us, but after not moving on Department of Homeland Security for 11-23 of a year, the then-majority party added into that bill a piece of legislation they knew would not pass in the United States Senate. Democrats would not be for it. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman knew they wouldn't be for it, and the gentleman knew they couldn't get 60 votes. Notwithstanding that, they passed a piece of legislation that directly resulted in the shutdown of government.

I say that those are the facts.

As a matter of fact, we thought the President of the United States agreed with that bill, but somehow, in the some 900 feet of there to here, he changed his mind.

Maybe he talked to Ann Coulter or Sean Hannity. I don't know who the operative adviser was, but he changed his mind.

As a result, we had the longest shutdown in history.

The CBO says it cost at least \$11 billion. The economic adviser at the White House said that it was costing at least one-tenth of a point a week.

This resolution says: Shutdown is stupid.

I am sure some don't agree with that, because I have been in this Chamber when you have voted to keep the government shut down. And you don't like me saying that.

□ 1230

Your Speaker asked you to open up the government and 144 of you—your Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, not a Democrat, said: Look, this is stupid. We need to open up the government—voted no. Now, it passed because all of us voted with 87 Republicans, including your present leader, who voted yes to open up the government.

This resolution is so simple. A shutdown is stupid. That is all it says. We will see how you vote. And I am going to say something about some people who think it is stupid.

I want to thank my friend from Virginia, Ms. WEXTON, for her leadership on this issue. She represents a district, as I do, where there are many hard-working Federal employees, who were negatively affected.

We had an argument here about whether we ought to give people a 2.6 percent raise, a COLA adjustment, to keep them even with the economy. And we voted to give them nothing—zero, zip. Not a cost-of-living adjustment. No pay at all.

I see my friend, the minority leader, on the floor. He said, not paying 800,000 people was unacceptable. I agree with him. I think it is unacceptable. I think asking people to work and then not paying them is not a moral thing to do.

This resolution, as I said, is simple. It is one I believe nearly every Member of this House ought to support, unless you support shutting down the government of the United States of America.

It says, a shutdown should never be a strategy in negotiations over funding, period, full stop.

We just endured 35 days of a dangerous and unnecessary partial government shutdown that cost 800,000 American workers to be denied their paychecks and that the CBO says, as I just said, \$11 billion was the cost. Those are the direct costs.

Our resolution makes it clear that such a use of shutdowns, or the threat of shutdowns, ought not to be tolerated in our political system. Now, this resolution says that, but I am going to have some other people who are going to say that as well.

No other country has this phenomena. I can't find another country that shuts its government down. In Australia, if you shut the government down, the government falls, so you have to form a new government.

There is no reason why Americans should have to live under the threat of being taken hostage, yet again, the next time there is an unresolved debate over an issue, whatever the issue might be.

Even many Republican leaders agree that using a shutdown is wrong. I think most leaders, as a matter of fact, not everyone.

Senate Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL very definitively called shutdowns "a failed policy."

And Senator SUSAN COLLINS, rightfully, said, just a few days ago that: "Shutdowns represent the ultimate failure to govern and should never be used as a weapon"—let me repeat that—"and should never be used as a weapon to achieve an outcome."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues all know LAMAR ALEXANDER, the former Governor of Tennessee, former Secretary of Education, a Member of the United States Senate, and someone who was prominently mentioned and regularly mentioned as a candidate for President of the United States on the Republican ticket. Here is what he said: "It is always wrong for either side to use shutting down the government as a bargaining chip in budget negotiations."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to hear this, Senator ALEXANDER: "It should be as off-limits as chemical weapons are to warfare." Could Senator ALEXANDER have said it any more powerfully that shutdowns are not an option? That is all this resolution says.

Sadly, I think a lot of you are going to vote no, I suppose, on the theory that you think: No, if we don't get our way, shutting down the government is our option. That is certainly what you told Mr. BOEHNER and then Leader MCCARTHY.

This resolution says, let's not allow that to happen again. We now have 3 weeks to avert the next shutdown. I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will present us with a bipartisan agreement on how best to invest in border security. We all need to do our job.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join us on this resolution to make it clear to our Federal employees, to our contractors, to the American people, and, yes, to the rest of the world that we don't believe shutting down the government of the United States of America is an option in negotiations. Vote for this resolution. You know that shutting down government is not a positive result of our failures.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS). The gentleman from North Carolina has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, the comments that we just heard from the well, from the majority leader, fail to mention one critical point about this resolution.

This resolution doesn't do anything to stop a future shutdown. It is designed, in its purpose to give cover to a number on the other side of the aisle who voted in this very Chamber to not fund those who were deemed essential pay at a critical time. In fact, indeed, the very sponsor of this resolution voted against giving pay to those men and women who continue to show up to vote and now somehow are going to vote on a resolution and make it all okay. If we are going to have history, let's make sure it is accurate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, what is stupid is not securing the border.

Mr. Speaker, let's just cut to the chase. If Democrats would support now what they supported then, there never would have been a shutdown. Ten years ago, all kinds of Senators—Senators Biden, FEINSTEIN, SCHUMER, Obama, and Clinton—all supported money for a barrier on the border.

Senator Obama said this: "We simply cannot allow people to pour into the United States undetected, undocumented, and unchecked. Americans are right to demand better border security and better enforcement of our immigration laws."

Secretary Clinton said this: "I voted numerous times as a Senator to spend money to build a barrier to try to prevent illegal immigrants from coming in."

Oh, how times have changed.

Where are the Democrats today? What is the position of the left today? Congressman BLUMENAUER: Abolish ICE.

Candidate Clinton: We need a borderless hemisphere.

The Speaker of the United States House of Representatives said: Walls are immoral.

And the person they selected to give the State of the Union response, a gubernatorial candidate in Georgia, said she is okay with noncitizens voting.

Oh, how times have changed.

All we are asking for is, do what you said before, be for what you were for before, and let's build a border security wall.

Let's focus on one simple thing here. Let's do what is best for the country. Everyone knows a sovereign Nation should control its borders. Everyone knows that a border security wall will help with this caravan phenomena we have watched over the last several months. Let's build a border security wall. If we can agree on that—and Democrats were all for it just a couple of years ago—there never would have been a shutdown and we would be serving the American people.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. CLAY of Missouri, and a distinguished member of our committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people are listening to what is being said here on the floor, because they are actually getting an honest flavor of where some of my friends on the other side of the aisle actually are.

Everybody, Mr. JORDAN says, agrees we need a wall, a barrier on the border. Actually, not everybody does. Actually, most polls show most Americans don't support that, and that number is increasing: the opposition.

Federal workers make more than their private sector counterparts, despite the fact that the official study shows they are 31 percent behind their private sector counterparts, and there are differences because of the differences in the nature of the work.

What you are also hearing, besides Darwinian "survival of the fittest" rhetoric and Marie Antoinette, "let them eat cake" kind of rhetoric coming out of this administration and some Members of this body, which I think reflects poorly on an understanding about where the average American, including the average Federal employee, actually is and what their needs really are—and they don't demand much—but respect is something they do demand, and it is something we offer them. That is why this resolution in front of us is so important.

Is it that hard to come together? Yeah, it is nonbinding, but it is aspirational. And even that, apparently, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle find difficult to swallow: a commitment not to shut down government for any reason.

Mr. Speaker, let's not hold Federal employees, and the American public they serve, hostage ever again. We will deal with our policy disputes separately, but we won't engage in shutting down the Federal Government. It is disastrous, it is reckless, it is dysfunctional, and it is a disservice to the people who sent us here. It is that simple. Never again shut down government.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what is hard to respond to?

It is hard to respond to my constituents at home who are witnessing the theater of the absurd.

It is hard to respond to Laurie Vargas, a mother in San Antonio, who lost her son, Jared, last summer to somebody who was here illegally, who was captured and released, captured and released, stopped by law enforcement, and then murdered her son.

It is extremely hard to respond to our members of the Border Patrol, who go down to the river, the Rio Grande in Laredo, and are down there with no cell signal, have no radio, can't see the river through the cane, they are down there by themselves, they know the cartels have operational control of the border, they know their lives are threatened if they speak out about the cartels, they know that there are terrorists who are leading cartel organizations across the border in Nuevo Laredo, and we are doing nothing to give them what they need to defend the United States of America.

I can't go home to the people in Texas 21 and explain to them why we are here for 2 days having show votes and then leave on a Wednesday. Explain that. Explain to the people why we are going to leave this afternoon at 1:00 not securing the border.

It makes absolutely no sense to the American people when they watch what happens in this body, and they wonder how the people's House leaves them with an unsecured border and nothing more than show votes, like we are going to have today, for political theater.

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

□ 1245

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of the resolution, both of them, the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from North Carolina.

I thank Ms. WEXTON and Mr. CONNOLLY for capturing the essence of what this legislation is all about. It is not contentious. We don't intend to divide this House. We intend to unify this House.

But I think as we speak to our colleagues and the American people, it is clear that the opening sentence says that this body believes that shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation. That is a word that I think all of us can join on.

And if we look at the desperation of our Federal workers, 800,000—270,000 in Texas, 4,000 in my district—you see the opening line: "My landlord is calling and I must pay." And the follow-up is: "I have no money."

All that we are saying today is to affirm the value of our constituents,

from the Coast Guard to FBI, to Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security, and Forest Service fighters who are on the front lines.

To my good friend from Texas, I can't count the times I have been to the border and seen barriers and fencing, but what I do know is, yes, SHEILA JACKSON LEE has voted over and over for border security here, years ago, and made the first crunch of dollars that dealt with increasing Border Patrol when they were barely in existence by providing laptops and providing the kind of vehicles that they needed and worked with landowners who didn't want any kind of fence, stone or otherwise, but to be able to give them the support.

Now we need smart border security, technology with drones, better infrastructure, more ports of entry. Today, we hope that will happen, because it will happen because appropriators are sitting down.

But can we reflect? This shutdown was in the midst of Christmas when we had bills that Republicans and Democrats had signed onto that came from the Senate. We could vote.

This is saying that whatever our policy differences are, you never hold a Federal worker, a person who is serving his or her Nation, hostage. You never make them desperate.

You never make them have to call a congressional office, "I am about to be evicted," as my constituent did. We never let them lose their house. We never let them bring their children out of school, as some had to do.

You never let them do as they are doing in my district right now, going to get groceries. And you never let them hear the words: "Go to a bank. I don't know why they just can't walk into a bank." Or someone else says: "It is okay. They are doing it for their Nation."

That is what this is about. It is simply allowing us to tell a reservist from the Middle East, Edith Banda, that she doesn't have to sell her belongings because she doesn't have a job because she is a Federal worker and she had been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution, and I ask them to stand for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Res. 79, which expresses the strong sense of Congress that government shutdowns are detrimental to the nation and should never occur again.

I am pleased to be an original co-sponsor of this important resolution that condemns the President's callous decision to shut down the federal government for 35 days, furloughing 800,000 civil servants and forcing nearly half that many to work without pay, and which costs the economy more than \$11 billion in lost productivity and economic output.

The collateral damage caused by the Trump Shutdown was substantial, long lasting, and unnecessary because it could have been avoided had the President not reneged on his promise to sign the continuing resolution passed by the Senate unanimously on December 19, 2018.

Because the President broke his promise, frontline federal employees, including law enforcement and public safety personnel, worked without pay from December 22 through January 25, 2019.

The way these federal workers, many of whom risk their lives in the service of this country, were treated was shameful.

This included around 14,000 FBI agents, 54,000 Customs and Border Protection agents, 47,000 Transportation Security Officers, and 6,000 Forest Service firefighters.

TSA employees received their last paycheck on December 28 and this single paycheck had to stretch much further than originally intended.

The shutdown forced some employees to look for new jobs or take on extra work, and the pressure was immense for employees and families with no other source of income.

Among those not receiving a pay check for their work were 3,200 Secret Service agents who risk their lives every single day to protect President Trump and his family.

Speaker PELOSI's decision to delay the State of the Union was in defense of the Secret Service agents who would be forced to work without pay.

In addition to the federal employees working without pay, hardworking federal employees at agencies like the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Agriculture, and NASA had been furloughed without pay, plunging them and their families into uncertainty.

These are real American families that were put through an unwarranted and unnecessary shutdown, and they suffered because of it.

Many federal employees were furloughed, and those deemed essential were expected to work without pay.

American families were stuck wondering how they were going to get by without an income, especially since things like rent, groceries, children's prescriptions and general day-to-day living costs must still be paid whether the government is fully functional or not.

The Trump Shutdown ended when the Speaker PELOSI made the President face reality that the vast majority of the American people and their representatives in Congress did not support wasting \$5.7 billion on an unnecessary and immoral wall that the President promised Mexico would pay for.

Not only were Americans struggling to pay for their day-to-day expenses but veterans and military families were suffering as well.

The military was also suffering in other areas.

For example, changes of station for military personnel were delayed and facility and weapons maintenance was suspended.

Military commissaries (base grocery stores) were shut down and military families were forced to shop elsewhere, costing up to 30 percent more on average than at the commissaries.

The United States Coast Guard went without funding for thirty-five days.

This was an added expense that added up very quickly, especially for military families living in cities with a high cost of living.

Edith Banda who recently returned from a reservist deployment in the Middle East was among thousands of people in the Houston area who felt impact of the government shutdown.

Edith was unable to work her federal job in downtown Houston for 35 days.

Making matters worse, she and dozens of others in Houston were unable to seek temporary private sector work because such jobs require permission, and the people who process those requests were also furloughed.

Edith had begun selling her personal possessions to make ends meet.

There are so many other issues that could be tackled with the money Trump wants to spend on the border wall.

With an increase of \$265 million the Department of Justice could hire 2,000 new police officers and make steps towards making many communities a safer place.

With an increase of \$99 million the Office of National Drug Control Policy could support community-level efforts to address substance abuse programs in nearly 730 additional communities.

With an increase of \$200 million the Economic Development Administration could create or preserve 31,000 jobs for our hardworking Americans.

With an additional \$20 million Small Business Administration grants could support dozens more Women's Business and Veterans Outreach Centers providing business training, counseling and outreach to 47,000 additional US veterans and women.

These are the changes that American citizens deserve.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 79 could not come at a better time.

Having survived the Trump Shutdown, it is fitting and proper for the House of Representatives to go on record and state that the shutdown of the Government of the United States, or any portion thereof, causes substantial damage to Federal employees, to every American who benefits directly or indirectly from Federal services, to our Nation's economy, and to the reputation of the United States around the world.

Mr. Speaker, shutting down the Government of the United States, or any portion thereof, is not an acceptable tactic or strategy for resolving differences regarding policy, funding levels, or governing philosophy.

Given the damage mercilessly inflicted on the American people and the economy by the Trump Shutdown, Congress has a fiduciary duty to the American people to ensure the continued, uninterrupted operations of the Government of the United States and its services.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H. Res. 79.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, in consultation with my friend opposite, we are going to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia and then recognize the Republican leader after that, and then I will be prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution talks about not having more government shutdowns. We don't need a resolution for that. Of course, there shouldn't be government shutdowns. That is why, last year, this body passed a resolution to fund government, including Trump's border wall that he asked for.

We passed that out of this Chamber. It went to the Senate. And what did

they do? Nothing. The Senate did nothing. They did nothing for over 30 days. They just sat while the government shut down.

Why? Because the minority party in the U.S. Senate chooses to threaten to filibuster, and if they don't get everything they want, based on this threat to filibuster, they shut down government until such time as this Chamber or the President or whoever they want to bully around gives them everything. That is not the way government is supposed to work.

I had a conversation yesterday with a young man here in D.C. He said: "How are you going to end these government shutdowns? What is going to happen now?"

Well, gosh, we have appointed a conference committee. That is how it is supposed to work. The Homeland Security conference committee meets today. There are four Republicans and three Democrats, which reflects the makeup of that Chamber. There are 10 from this Chamber, 6 Democrats and 4 Republicans, which reflects the makeup of this Chamber.

That is the committee where you meet and you work these things out. That is the system the Founders of our country set up for us here. The problem is we have gotten away from that. We do continuing resolutions like we shouldn't, and we sit here and one side has to get everything they want.

Why does it happen that way? Because one side, the Democratic side, wants to get everything they want. If they don't get everything they want, they want to shut down government and then falsely blame everybody else. That is not the way it is supposed to work.

I am glad we have a conference committee. My Senator from West Virginia SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO is actually on that conference committee that is supposed to meet today to work out exactly what we are going to do with the border wall and funding Homeland Security.

That is what we should do with every bill. That is why, last year, when we were in the majority, we actually passed the appropriations bills over to the U.S. Senate. Do you know what they did? Nothing.

It doesn't take 60 votes to pass a bill. It takes 60 votes to invoke cloture. That is different than passing a bill.

The dysfunction in the U.S. Senate cannot continue to reign in this country and cause government shutdowns, particularly when the minority party wants everything.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

We have dozens of people who are willing to speak, but in the interest of time, none more important than the Republican leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 79, a glorified press release that the majority is having this Chamber spend time on during another yet underwhelming legislative week.

At a time when the country expects its leaders in Washington to look forward, this House majority is looking backwards. When our country expects solutions, they are using this Chamber to settle political scores.

As hundreds of thousands of Americans painfully experienced, portions of our Federal Government were shut down for 35 days, a shameful record under this majority's watch. It was a shutdown that never had to happen.

Let's recall last December when this House passed an appropriations bill that would have funded the government, secured the border, and provided disaster assistance to the millions affected by hurricanes and fires. Most importantly, it was a bill that would have been signed into law. This occurred after then-Leader PELOSI declared in the Oval Office earlier that month that a House majority couldn't pass such a bill.

That legislation went to the Senate and, alas, Senator SCHUMER stopped it. And in doing so, once again, Senator SCHUMER shut this government down.

From the moment Senator SCHUMER blocked consideration of that appropriation bill, President Trump and congressional Republicans offered solution after solution after solution after solution to solve the challenge. In all, the President offered four reasonable solutions to end the shutdown and secure the border.

The Democrats never offered one. In fact, they went on vacation and political fundraisers to Puerto Rico. They littered this Chamber with messaging bills that didn't come close to solving the problem and would never be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the very last solution the President offered. I want to focus on it because it met the Democrats halfway. It was the truest form of compromise this town has seen in quite some time. It would have secured portions of the border with barriers, and it would have provided certainty to the very communities that my friends on the other side of the aisle have stood on this floor for countless hours to claim they want to help.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the actions of this majority when presented with that opportunity and following the shutdown tell you all you need to know about who they truly want to help.

Do you know who they want to help? Themselves.

After the President signed a 3-week continuing resolution, the Speaker gloated with a Presidential-style enrollment ceremony. Democrats marveled at her exercise of raw political motivation. Many in the media responded like they were beat reporters from their hometown team. This all sounds like a historic event.

What exactly was everyone celebrating? They were celebrating nothing. They were celebrating achieving nothing. They were celebrating the status quo that suits their political interest and personal pursuits of self-righteousness, a status quo that causes pain and suffering for Americans across this country.

Here are just a few examples:

There have been 266,000 criminal aliens arrested in the last 2 years. This includes charges and convictions of 100,000 assaults, nearly 30,000 sex crimes, and 4,000 violent killings.

Three hundred Americans die every week from heroin, and more than 90 percent of heroin comes from across the southern border.

Roughly 10,000 children are being smuggled into the U.S. every year to be sold for human trafficking.

They are celebrating a status quo that leaves 700,000 DACA-designated individuals unsure about their future.

It was the best display of politics that this country is sick and tired of seeing: zero-sum politics and nothing ever changes.

I would like to spend some time and reflect on Americans and their families who may not have been celebrating the status quo preserved by this majority:

Jerry David;
 Sherri David;
 Deputy Josie Greathouse Fox;
 Pierce Corcoran;
 Officer Ronil Singh;
 Clinton Howell;
 Robert Page;
 Justin Lee;
 Ellie Bryant;
 Grayson Hacking;
 Dominic Durden;
 Edwin Jackson;
 Grant Ronnebeck;
 Kenneth Scott Mahr;
 Officer Kevin Will;
 Sergeant Brandon Mendoza;
 Sergeant Cory Wride;
 Josh Wilkerson;
 Spencer Golvach;
 Kate Steinle;
 Detective Michael Davis;
 Deputy Danny Oliver;
 Bob Barry;
 Parker Moore;
 Officer Andy Chavez;
 Lauren Bump;
 Louise Sollowin;
 Serenity Reedy;
 Vanessa Pham;
 Kathleen Byham;
 Agent Brian Terry;
 Officer Henry Canales;
 Donald Mayle;
 Breanna Schneller;
 Jennifer Lee Hampton;
 Officer Andrew Widman;
 Officer Rodney Johnson;
 Buddy Mason;
 Adrienne Shelly;
 Mollie Tibbetts;
 Ronald da Silva;
 Sarah Root;
 Drew Rosenberg;
 Kara Willingham;
 Oscar Navarro;

Margaret Kostelnik;
Andres Duran;
Rocky Jones; and
Michael Grubbs.

These are just 50 names of Americans whose lives have been lost to illegal immigration. They no longer have their voice, but we can and must be their voice today. And if these names sound familiar, it is because we heard them on the news.

I would like to reflect on others who certainly weren't celebrating the status quo.

□ 1300

The names may sound familiar because these are the same individuals who then-Leader PELOSI set a record on this floor just a year ago in February for more than 8 hours defending the passion of DACA and shutting the government down: Vanessa Rodriguez; Ana Sanchez; Juan Escalante; Cesar Vargas; Nicole Robles; Jacqueline Romo; Andrea Sibra; Cesar Espinoza; Denise Rojas; Ray Pineta; Kelly; Crystal; Carlos; Marian; Brittany; Hugo; Fernando; Javier Noras; Marco Dorado; Mayra; Fernanda Herrera; Emily; Claudia; Bruna; Cynthia Sanchez; Jose Castillo; Hugo Alexander Acosta; Denia Candela; Luis Galvin; Hector Rivera Suarez; Dalia Medina; Juan Carlos Navarro; Patricia Yulowa; Maria Praley; Jose Manuel Santobo; Carlos Emilio Diaz; Luis Roberto Ucerra; Sofia De La Varga; Novella Vladimar; Gloria Ricconi; Alonzo Rivarola; Yuri Hernandez; Oscar Canajoe, Jr.; Ashley Lamadrid; Gladys Clompka; Denaya Joseph; Miriam Ochoa Garbay; Han Yoon Li.

Mr. Speaker, as this House adjourns for the week today—after just one rule bill—I implore my colleagues to take some time and think deeply about these individuals, their families, and what our country stands for. It certainly isn't this political stunt by this majority, and it certainly isn't the status quo they are so proud to protect.

As Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we are a very small group with a very large responsibility. The burden on us 435 Americans is to represent 325 million Americans faithfully and to work together so tomorrow is better than today. Let us not let these political distractions get in the way of our duty. Instead, let's actually work together to give a voice to the voiceless.

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

Mr. Speaker, these are powerful words by our Republican leader. There has been a lot of debate. I don't think a more somber moment have I experienced this week on the House floor than when the 50 names were read out, where their loved ones will never be able to welcome them home. There will be ball games that are missed. There will be calls that are no longer made of, "Welcome home, Daddy," or "welcome home" to a son or a daughter.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about the pain and anguish of Federal

employees. Indeed, there are real hardships there that are undeniable. But, Mr. Speaker, they are getting their pay back. For the lives of the 50 people who were just named on this House floor, there is no returning. Their lives were extinguished, Mr. Speaker, and we must do something about that as well.

I am committed to my colleagues opposite to work with them to protect Federal workers, as long as they are willing to work with us to protect the communities and the safety of moms and dads from coast to coast.

On that, it is important that we have no more show votes. This resolution is meaningless other than to provide cover for some on the other side of the aisle who voted against giving pay to those who were essential employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me thank all of the body for engaging in this debate and for the minority leader bringing forth those names. But let me say that H. Res. 79 is not about the undocumented, nor is it a political stunt. It is not messaging for some political purpose. This resolution is about compassion and respect for fellow Americans who happen to be Federal workers who deserve to stay on the job and deserve to get a paycheck, and for the work and the service that they give to the rest of the country.

My friends on the other side know better. They know better, that shutdowns are harmful to our economy as well as our national security. They know that. The Federal Government should always be open for business, and Federal employees should not be held as hostages.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a favorable vote on the passage of H. Res. 79, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 79, a resolution expressing the sense of the House that shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur.

And as a Member of the Appropriations Committee, I know firsthand how terrible this shutdown has been. This past weekend I met with Coast Guard families impacted by the 35-day government shutdown.

Families told me they were skipping medications and couldn't afford to put gas in the car because of the shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, these families did nothing wrong.

In fact, they have gone Above and Beyond the call of duty by signing up to serve in the Coast Guard.

And how did President Trump reward their sacrifices?

By inflicting a needless, 35-day government shutdown on these families. By using these families as political pawns.

Let me be clear: these Coast Guard families deserve far better than this. And so do all our federal workers—who bore the brunt of this shutdown through no fault of their own.

The CBO estimates that this shutdown cost our economy 11 billion dollars—including 3 billion dollars that will never be recovered.

It also caused immeasurable fear and anxiety for families.

So, while we can never fully repair the damage that was caused by this dangerous, irresponsible shutdown, I hope that President Trump and Congressional Republicans will take these stories to heart and learn from the damage they caused.

Simply put, families can't afford another shutdown.

So, let's pass this resolution and get back to work for the American people. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 79, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORKFORCE PAY RAISE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 87 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 790.

Will the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1306

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. SABLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-5 offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-5 offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—243

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

NOES—183

Abraham	Arrington	Barr
Aderholt	Babin	Bergman
Allen	Bacon	Biggs
Amash	Baird	Bilirakis
Amodi	Balderson	Bishop (UT)
Armstrong	Banks	Brady

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

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1334

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CLYBURN, COOK, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, VISCLOSKEY, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SABLAN, 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. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 87, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amend-

ments 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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Brooks of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 790 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON PAY ADJUSTMENT FOR EMPLOYEES DISCIPLINED FOR SEXUAL MISCONDUCT.

During calendar year 2019, no increase in pay as authorized under this Act may be provided to any Federal employee who has been disciplined for sexual misconduct under chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit amends the Democratic bill by prohibiting taxpayer dollars from being used to give raises to Federal employees who have been disciplined for sexual misconduct. Without this change, Federal employees who have engaged in sexual misconduct in the workplace would be rewarded for their bad actions.

The Republican motion to recommit amends the bill and reports it back forthwith with an amendment. If it passes, the Republican motion to recommit will allow an immediate vote on final passage of the bill.

The underlying premise of the Democratic bill is that our Federal civilian workforce should be treated the same as members of our armed services, who received a 2.6 percent pay raise in last year's NDAA.

The Federal Government is blessed with amazing Federal employees. As a former United States attorney, I led an office of those amazing Federal employees. I worked with countless other dedicated Federal employees.

Our dedicated civil servants work day in and day out to protect and serve the American public. We are most grateful for their service.

The vast majority of Federal employees are hardworking. They don't engage in conduct unbecoming their civil

service. However, those who have been disciplined for sexual misconduct should not be rewarded with a 2.6 per cent pay increase.

The bill before the House today treats every Federal employee the same. Good, bad, competent, or not, they all get a pay raise on top of automatic step increases and promotions.

Earlier today, my colleagues have asked: Doesn't everyone deserve a pay raise? The answer is no. A broken disciplinary process in our Federal agencies make it nearly impossible to fire anyone. This Democratic bill is nothing short of a handout to individuals who engage in sexual misconduct in the workplace, and that is wrong.

How can we reward anyone who harms Federal employees in this manner? How can we reward people who abuse the public's trust in this way?

Let me give you a few past examples.

A 2018 PBS report included interviews with 34 current and former female U.S. Forest Service employees who alleged discrimination, harassment, and sexual assault at the agency. Do these employees who perpetrated this type of behavior deserve automatic raises? No.

In 2017, an NBC affiliate identified almost 100 cases of Federal employees viewing pornography on government computers. Should these employees be rewarded for this behavior with automatic pay raises? No.

In 2015, DOJ's Office of Inspector General found that DEA agents participated in sex parties in Colombia involving strippers and prostitutes paid for by drug cartels. Does this type of conduct warrant automatic pay raises? I don't think so.

A recent study—and this is horrible—shows that sexual harassment is commonplace in Federal offices. One in five women have experienced harassment in the workplace, and nearly 9 percent of male employees report the same. It took 7 years for a former trial lawyer from the Justice Department to win a ruling from the EEOC confirming she was harassed by two male supervisors.

In 2018, five ICE officials told The Washington Post the agency hadn't yet responded to sexual harassment claims they filed more than a year ago against a manager who they said pressured them to view nude photos.

Our disciplinary process is confidential and murky. It varies agency by agency. We don't know how many employees have been disciplined for sexual misconduct and still remain on the job. We have serious faults we must address before we give across-the-board pay raises.

During consideration of this bill in Rules, there was bipartisan sentiment to look at longstanding issues that face our civil servants. Retention, private-sector wage comparison, and millennial recruitment were some of those issues. But this was a hastily drafted bill, and this is not how the process should work.

□ 1345

The American people deserve a Federal workforce with high standards for appropriate conduct. Federal employees should feel safe and protected doing the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, we have problems in our Federal workforce that we must deal with before we give across-the-board pay raises.

The Republican motion to recommit protects due process rights of all Federal employees by ensuring that only those substantiated claims for which an employee has been disciplined will result in an employee being ineligible for a pay raise.

It is inexcusable that the Democrat bill, as drafted, would treat victims of sexual harassment the same as the perpetrators who may still be drawing Federal paychecks. Taxpayer dollars should not be used to give a pay raise to these bad actors.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit; and if it fails, I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed bill.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the slander we have just heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have rarely heard such cynicism on the floor of the House of Representatives. Oh, no. My friends on the other side are right to kind of cabal because there is so much cynicism; but this one takes the cake.

We are here to honor the Federal workforce, not slander them with insinuation.

To listen to the gentlewoman from Indiana, one might infer that the Federal Government is riddled with people who are guilty of all kinds of nasty, near crimes and offenses, and should not be rewarded for it.

I wonder if we would use the same standard ourselves here in the House of Representatives. How many in the last Congress, especially on a particular side of the aisle, have resigned over sexual harassment charges? And that wasn't insinuation, that was real. So let's not have a double standard.

And by the way, I say to my friends, especially on this side of the aisle, let us not be distracted by what is really going on.

We are simply trying, after the worst shutdown in American history, to say to our own employees, 2.1 million: "You are valued. You are respected."

To actually vote for this is not only to say the opposite and deny them a simple cost of living increase that we have already given the military; it is, in fact, to say: By the way, we buy into this cynicism. We think you are riddled with guilt by association and insinuation.

So we have an opportunity, in defeating this MTR, one of the most cynical

I have ever heard, to actually make a positive statement to our Federal employees.

Stand up and be heard. Say "no" to shutdowns. Say "yes" to our Federal employees, and restore their sense of respect with our dignity.

Defeat this MTR.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Passage of the bill, if ordered;

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 79; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 216, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—206

Abraham	Emmer	Kelly (MS)
Aderholt	Estes	Kelly (PA)
Allen	Ferguson	Kim
Amodei	Finkenauer	King (IA)
Armstrong	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Arrington	Fleischmann	Kinzinger
Axne	Flores	Kustoff (TN)
Babin	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Bacon	Foxx (NC)	Lamborn
Baird	Fulcher	Latta
Balderson	Gaetz	Lesko
Banks	Gallagher	Long
Barr	Gianforte	Loudermilk
Bergman	Gibbs	Lucas
Biggs	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Billirakis	Gonzalez (OH)	Luria
Bishop (UT)	Gooden	Marchant
Brady	Gosar	Marshall
Brindisi	Gottheimer	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Granger	Mast
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	McAdams
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Buck	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Bucshon	Green (TN)	McClintock
Budd	Griffith	McHenry
Burchett	Grothman	McKinley
Burgess	Guest	Meadows
Byrne	Guthrie	Meuser
Calvert	Hagedorn	Miller
Carter (GA)	Harris	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Chabot	Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)
Cheney	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Cline	Hice (GA)	Norman
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Nunes
Cole	Hill (AR)	O'Halleran
Collins (GA)	Holding	Olson
Collins (NY)	Hollingsworth	Palazzo
Conaway	Horn, Kendra S.	Palmer
Cook	Houlahan	Pence
Crawford	Hudson	Perry
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Porter
Cunningham	Hunter	Posey
Curtis	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe
Davidson (OH)	Johnson (LA)	Reed
Delgado	Johnson (OH)	Reschenthaler
DesJarlais	Johnson (SD)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Riggleman
Duffy	Joyce (OH)	Roby
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Dunn	Katko	Roe, David P.

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano

Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Bost
Comer
Davis, Rodney
Jones

NOT VOTING—10
LaHood
Mullin
Payne
Sensenbrenner

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
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speler
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Weston
Wild
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
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
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
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
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse

Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
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
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Clay
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Weston
Yarmuth

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
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
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
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
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawsone (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodeli
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Brady
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

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
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
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
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOT VOTING—12

Bost
Comer
Davis, Rodney
Hill (CA)

Jones
LaHood
Mullin
Payne

□ 1408

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, if I would have been here, I would have voted yes.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, if I would have been here, I would have voted yes.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS ARE DETRIMENTAL TO NATION AND SHOULD NOT OCCUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 79) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Government shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 163, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]
YEAS—249

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

Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer

Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Klimer
Kim
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum

McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)

Richmond
Riggleman
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil

Stevens
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wittman
Yarmuth

Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

□ 1419

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, January 30, I missed a vote on H. Res. 79. Had I been present for the vote on H. Res. 79, I would have voted “no.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

NAYS—163

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Jayapal
Jeffries
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Folx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moelenaar
Mooney (WV)

Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—20

Blunt Rochester
Bost
Collins (GA)
Comer
Davis, Rodney
Emmer
Harder (CA)
Jones
LaHood
Long
Mullin
Payne
Raskin
Ruppersberger

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business following 1 minutes. The House will recess to allow for a security sweep of the House Chamber prior to the President's State of the Union Address. The House will meet again at approximately 8:35 p.m. in a joint session with the Senate for the purpose of receiving an address from the President of the United States. Members are advised that there will be no votes in the House on Tuesday.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, Madam Speaker, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of those suspensions will be announced by close of business Friday.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 840, the Veterans' Access to Child Care Act, introduced by Representatives BROWNLEY and HIGGINS. This bill would make permanent the VA's childcare pilot program and expand it so that veterans across the Nation who are parents or grandparents have a convenient, cost-free option for childcare when they have VA medical appointments.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as it relates to the suspension calendar, I know, this week, there was an extra bill added to the suspension calendar that wasn't on the list by close of business last week. Do you anticipate this Friday's list being amended again the following week, or should that be a complete list?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as I pointed out, additional items are possible to be added. We said that last week. We did add one. It was noticed on Monday, and we voted on it today. In effect, we met the 3-day rule, not the 72-hour rule, but that was a suspension. There may be others that we will add.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, clearly, as a suspension, it wasn't in the traditional sense—obviously, it went down. There being a sense of the House resolution, typically, those are resolutions where both sides work together.

I ask the gentleman, do they anticipate approaching senses of the House in a partisan way or, hopefully, in a bipartisan way, where we can work together to get a true sense of the House that could pass?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we want to move on a bipartisan basis. The good news was that this resolution, although it failed to have a two-thirds vote, did have a bipartisan vote with more than 20 Republicans voting for it, which I appreciate. Of course, the balance voted against the resolution, which said that shutdowns were bad.

But we will certainly try to give as much notice as possible to the gentleman and to his party.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, as we approach bipartisan resolutions, we hope that the gentleman from Maryland and his side would work with us on those. It could have been a resolution that actually passed, had we been able to work together and, hopefully, include some language about border security.

As we look to the conference committee that is now meeting, as we talk about border security especially being the centerpiece of the big debate over government funding that, hopefully, we get agreement to, there were reports that, last week, the Democrat majority was going to roll out their plan for homeland security. Ultimately, that plan wasn't, in fact, rolled out. Is there going to be a rollout? As we have these negotiations—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland to let him know that his side said they wouldn't negotiate during a shutdown. Obviously, the shutdown is over now. Will there be a counteroffer now put on the table?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the conference com-

mittee has either met or is meeting. It is my understanding that Chairwoman LOWEY is going to have a press conference after the first initial meeting, so that we are in a conference. That is good news. I am sure the conferees are going to talk about proposals that they have to reach border security.

I might say that, although it appears to be the central part, in terms of our perspective, a shutdown is not about border security or any other particular issue. It is that it is a bad policy to shut down the Government of the United States. Notwithstanding that, I expect that Chairwoman LOWEY will be explaining our position in the conference.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I look forward to hearing that proposal laid out. As the House and Senate Republican and Democrat conferees meet together, I do think, and have an optimistic approach, that we are not that far removed from reaching a deal, if we can ultimately find a way to put a real amount on the table that shows how we can secure the border, as our experts—the men and women who risk their lives to secure the border—have suggested in their proposal, if we can come to a place where we can agree on a way to actually achieve border security, and that includes physical barriers.

When the gentleman from Maryland, I think it was 2 weeks ago, was talking about some Democrats who were going over to the White House back then, it was said that they didn't have the authority to negotiate. Do the Democrat conferees have the authority to negotiate on behalf of the Democrat majority in the House?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Certainly.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's quick candor.

Madam Speaker, as we wrap this up, I would ask about an issue that a number of our Members were concerned about and hope this is not a trend. In the House Natural Resources Committee, the majority, yesterday, as they were proposing their new rules for the committee—and each committee, as we know, proposes their new rules as a new Congress is sworn in and established on a committee level—in the oath that is administered to men and women who come before the committee to testify, the original proposal suggested removing “so help you God” from the oath. One of the Members on our side noticed that omission and put an amendment in place to restore “so help you God” in the oath. Fortunately, that was added back in.

I would ask the gentleman, is this going to be a trend? Is there going to be some kind of general movement by committees to try to remove “so help you God” from the oaths that are administered to witnesses?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, not as far as I know.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, hopefully, it is not a trend that we see.

Madam Speaker, I know the last few weeks have been contentious. We have a lot at stake as we try to get an agreement on something that actually can work to properly fund the government and properly secure the border.

I am glad that the conferees are finally meeting. I hope we don't see any attempt to run out the clock, because we do have a limited amount of time, although it is far more than enough time to reach an agreement, if all parties are truly there in earnest, and I do think they are.

I hope that they put all options on the table and listen to all the proper expert testimony that has been given on why we need to have certain amounts to secure the border and certain tactics and techniques and technology that are all going to be part of this.

Hopefully, at the end of that discussion, very quickly, they can reach an agreement that we can then bring to the House and the Senate and pass in a bipartisan way that the President can sign to finally properly fund the government and secure our Nation's border.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1430

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I share the gentleman's view. I hope the conferees can reach an agreement that will be agreeable to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, both the House and the Senate, and the President.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I know we look forward to welcoming the President of the United States to this House Chamber on Tuesday night for the State of the Union Address.

I appreciate the work that we are going to do together to secure our Nation's border and properly fund our government, and unless the gentleman has something else he would like to add, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 2019, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2019; HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, February 4, 2019; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, February 5, 2019, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR.
JAMES HAROLD BOWLES

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life of Dr. James Harold Bowles. Dr. Bowles was born in June 1921, and raised on the Pea Ridge in Goochland County, Virginia.

Dr. Bowles served in the U.S. Army and graduated from Virginia Union University before attending medical school and returning home to Goochland to open his medical practice. As he began his career serving his patients, Dr. Bowles continued his service as the first African American to serve on the Goochland County Board of Supervisors where he worked to strengthen our community for 32 years.

He was a lifetime member of the NAACP, a trustee of Emmaus Baptist Church, and an active member of community organizations across central Virginia. Above all, he was a beloved husband, father, brother, uncle, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He left an indelible mark on our community.

Madam Speaker, I leave you with the advice Dr. Bowles frequently gave. May it guide our work here in this Chamber.

SMILE. S, seek to understand before being understood; M, make others feel important; I, it is not about me; L, listen twice as much as you speak; E, emphatically, enthusiastically, and quickly admit it when you are wrong.

When you do this, dialogue can be easily achieved.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF
WILLIAM R. CARTEAUX

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of a great Hoosier, William R. Carteaux, the President and CEO of the Plastics Industry Association, and a dedicated supporter of the U.S. plastics industry which employs nearly 1 million Americans.

Mr. Carteaux passed away on December 10, 2018, after bravely fighting leukemia. Having worked with Bill, his passion for the U.S. plastics industry, which employs more than 50,000 Hoosiers and more than 10,000 in my district alone, was unmatched.

Bill pushed the entire industry to focus on recycling and sustainability, bringing together industry leaders and innovators to find effective market-based solutions to our environmental challenges.

Bill was first diagnosed with leukemia in 2016, and he set out to beat the disease for himself and others. He eventually chaired the Washington area Leukemia & Lymphoma Society

and raised hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The U.S. plastics industry is stronger today because of Bill's efforts, and he will be sorely missed.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Daniele, and his two daughters, as we honor his legacy and impact here in the House today.

RECOGNIZING NEW MEXICO ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPORTED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DURING THE SHUTDOWN

(Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the food banks and organizations across New Mexico that supported Federal employees, contractors, and their families during the shutdown.

I especially want to thank Arlene Murillo and the Border Patrol Agent Family Network in Sunland Park, New Mexico. It was an honor to witness their collaborative work, to feed their neighbors who were affected by the shutdown, or otherwise fighting hunger for other reasons.

New Mexicans were among the hardest hit when the government stopped paying its bills, but these organizations showed what it is to be New Mexicans, and embody the value to always have your neighbor's back.

Now that the damage and disruption of the shutdown is over, we as a Congress have a responsibility to ensure it never happens again. That is why I joined fellow freshman and signed on to the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns Act yesterday, to keep hardworking Americans from paying the price for Washington's brokenness.

Madam Speaker, I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FIRE
CHIEF JOHN WEAVER

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor one of Lancaster County's most honored public servants and a true hero, former Denver Fire Company Chief, John Weaver, who passed away on January 26.

John served our community for 50 years. He became a junior fireman when he was just 14 years old. He later joined the Denver Fire Company when he was 18, in 1969.

He held every officer position, including fire chief. He became a fire instructor, and most recently, he was one of the primary drivers for the fire department. He was a brave man who helped make the fire department what it is today.

John was also an entrepreneur who founded a manufacturing company,

Weaver Industries. Beyond working for the fire company and saving lives there, John was also involved in our community. He believed in giving back and serving others.

He served on the Cocalico School Board for 12 years, and coached golf and bowling. John found great joy in helping people and set a wonderful example for all of us.

He leaves behind a wife, three sons, and four grandchildren. May we remember his giving spirit and may he rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JACK
SHIFREL

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to honor the life of Jack Shifrel, a distinguished Army veteran, former Broward County Public Schools school board member, fierce veterans' advocate, and most importantly, my friend for 30 years.

Mr. Shifrel served as president of the Broward Veterans Coalition and was always on the front lines in responding to the critical needs of our community. He worked tirelessly to make sure the men and women who served our Nation maintained their dignity and well-being.

Jack was an indomitable civic force and had a lifelong passion for politics, serving 10 4-year terms as a Democratic Party committeeman in Broward County.

He was a passionate advocate for the underserved, a defender of civil rights, and someone who helped make Broward County a kinder, more compassionate community.

He was a dear friend and embodied the best of what it means to give back to your country and your community.

Although Jack is no longer with us, his legacy lives on through veterans that he served with, and the countless individuals whose lives he changed for the better.

Jack Shifrel was one of a kind, a selfless, compassionate, and tireless advocate for others in Broward County. He was a patriot in the truest sense, and will be profoundly missed, but never forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE
OF SCHOOL CHOICE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of school choice. Last week was National School Choice Week when individuals from all over the country gathered to raise awareness of different education options available to parents and their kids.

In my home State of Florida, we are blessed to have access to traditional public schools, charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, online learning, and home schooling. These diverse programs provide kids with different opportunities to excel in the learning environment that works best for them.

I think specifically of Hunter Frost, a young man with autism who I have gotten to know very well. Hunter attended Pepin Academies, a tuition-free charter school in our district that specializes in teaching students with learning and learning-related disabilities.

Hunter thrived at Pepin Academies, graduating third in his class. He went on to receive his associate's degree from Hillsborough Community College with an A average and has been accepted by my alma mater, the University of South Florida, where he plans to begin this fall.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have Hunter as an intern in my office, and I look forward to his success and to seeing him excel in college and beyond.

SOLIDARITY IN SALARY

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Solidarity in Salary Act, which would withhold paychecks from Members of Congress, the President, and the Vice President during a shutdown.

Everyone right now is trying to figure out who won the shutdown and who lost it. Well, here is the deal: Nobody won this thing, but the American people lost. We failed them. We turned our back on them, and they suffered.

Keeping the government open and running is our most basic responsibility. It is what our constituents ask of us. In just 3 weeks we managed to make them question whether Members of Congress were born without common sense, or whether we just get a frontal lobotomy after we are sworn in. And what did we get out of putting them through this misery? Nothing.

All that happened is we arrived at the same basic truth that we knew 5 weeks ago: that we had a deal. In these Halls we love to kiss up to vets, and cops, and firemen. All we do is thank them for their service, and rightfully so, because they put it all on the line each and every day.

But it is time that we actually try to emulate their service here. Because what they do, what they have to endure is that when they fail at their job, people die. People get hurt, and they have to live with that for the rest of their lives.

All this bill is talking about is us having skin in the game and not getting paid. We, as Members of Congress, should be feeling the same pain that we just inflicted on the American people.

SHUTDOWN TO END ALL SHUTDOWNS

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

Mrs. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I came to Washington to work across the aisle and create economic opportunities for Minnesota families.

Since I have gotten here, I have regularly met with Democrats and Republicans to discuss the issues so many Americans talk about around the kitchen table: better schools for their children, a fair shot at economic security for their family, and healthcare they can afford.

We have also discussed over the last several weeks the shutdown. This must never happen again. Yesterday, I joined many of my colleagues, freshman colleagues, to introduce a bill to prevent another shutdown, the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns Act.

This would prevent Federal workers from being used as pawns in future political negotiations. Our bill creates strong incentives to prevent another shutdown from occurring by withholding pay from Members of Congress and the executive branch, while forcing lawmakers to remain in Washington until a deal is reached.

Additionally, the bill ensures that the government will continue running, even if we can't get to an appropriations bill.

Americans deserve better. We can do better for them. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns Act and take a stand to never put politics over the American people again.

VIETNAMESE LOC HUNG GARDEN EVICTION

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to bring attention to the Vietnamese Government's violence and oppressive attacks on its own citizens in Loc Hung garden. For generations, families have thrived in this farming community, Loc Hung garden. They raised their children and care for their elders.

These citizens are law-abiding citizens, yet, the Vietnamese Government sent over 1,000 officers to destroy this community and displace over 200 families.

There was no due process, no day in court, and no compensation. Instead, the Vietnamese Government took land by force from its own citizens.

These tactics cannot go unnoticed, and the world must call this out for what it is: tyranny. I ask the Vietnamese Government to allow these families to return to their homes.

On behalf of the thousands of Vietnamese citizens living in Orange Coun-

ty, I ask the Vietnamese Government to cease its behavior, cease these oppressive tactics, and let the Vietnamese people live in peace and return to their land where they have been living for generations.

□ 1445

ETHICS IN PUBLIC SERVICE INCLUDED IN THE FOR THE PEOPLE ACT

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, the American people sent us here to clean up corruption and make Washington work for them. Restoring public trust in our system of government has to be one of our top priorities.

I am proud that the very first legislation I introduced this Congress is aimed at strengthening ethics rules and slowing the revolving door between industry lobbyists and executive branch agencies.

We need to bolster the firewall between public service and corporate lobbying to ensure public servants are putting the needs of the people first, not the industries they regulate.

I am very pleased the Ethics in Public Service Act was included in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, the first major government reform package we will consider this Congress. This bill will go a long way toward elevating the people's voice in our politics by restricting the influence of dark money in campaigns, defending voting rights protections, and limiting corporate influence.

Working together, we can build a government more responsive and effective in making progress for the American people.

THE SHUTDOWN TO END ALL SHUTDOWNS

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the bill that I introduced called the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns, or SEAS, Act, along with 21 of my fellow freshmen.

This bill will stop the use of government shutdowns as a tool in political debate and ensure that our Federal workers are never again held hostage when Congress and the President's office cannot agree.

Under this act, if a deal cannot be reached, Members of the House, the Senate, the Executive Office of the President, and his political appointees will have their pay suspended and their travel from D.C. curtailed.

To my fellow Michiganders: This bill was because of you. You asked me why the average TSA workers, Customs and Border Patrol employees, FAA employees, and FDA employees were punished

because of something they had nothing to do with. And I heard you.

To my fellow Members of Congress who may be reticent to support a bill that penalizes ourselves: This is a moment of leadership. This is a moment to acknowledge that we may not have started this shutdown, but it is our responsibility to prevent them from happening in the future.

Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues to do the right thing and support this bill.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, without objection, the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, and notwithstanding the requirement of clause 11(a)(4)(A) of rule X, of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. TURNER, Ohio
Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio
Mr. STEWART, Utah
Mr. CRAWFORD, Arkansas
Ms. STEFANIK, New York
Mr. HURD, Texas
Mr. RATCLIFFE, Texas
There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 116th Congress or until modified by me. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting day, perhaps more than most.

We have heard over and over again about Republicans supposedly causing

the shutdown, but in my days as a trial lawyer, judge, chief justice, it is always good to look at the evidence. And the evidence is very clear.

You had Republicans in the House and Senate and the President actually pass a spending bill in the House before the end of December, and the only thing that was keeping it from getting through the Senate was that Democrats there, led by Senator SCHUMER, would not negotiate. They arrived at no agreement to get 60 votes so that it could go forward with debate. That wasn't the Republicans.

In the position of the White House, President Trump made clear: This is negotiable, but we do need wall, we need barrier. Call it whatever you want.

He moved from talking about concrete to talking about the steel barrier. And having spent time with some other Members of Congress, invited by Congressman BIGGS and Congressman GOSAR down to the Arizona border, we saw a lot of it. And then it would just end. And then you saw a clear path right around the end of it as people kept coming, invading this country illegally.

From the border patrolmen, it was clear some were carrying big loads of drugs. Sometimes they are able to catch them, sometimes they are not. And it sounds like, from the times I spent on the border south of McAllen, southeast of McAllen, the Texas quadrant, more often than not, they don't catch the drugs coming in. It is an invasion. It is a huge problem.

And I was hearing people, friends across the other side of the aisle, some Senators who are Democrats, acknowledging: Yes, we need to do something. But when it came to negotiating, there was no negotiation.

So we had this bill today decrying how horrible shutdowns are. But if you look at the tactics, when the tactics of the leaders—and I say at least some of the leaders—of one party are “we are not going to negotiate; we are not going to compromise; we are not going to do what is best for the country,” in effect, as they have stated on prior occasions, as they have voted on prior occasions, some of them, that is what causes a shutdown.

You know, we did not need this shutdown. We shouldn't have had to have this shutdown. It should have been agreed back in December by at least some of the Senators so that we could have gotten a spending bill.

Of course, we had spending passed on three-fourths of the government. It was about one-fourth of the government that was not funded. So we talk about a shutdown. It wasn't a full shutdown. But, still, it did harm to those who were not getting paid.

But as I would go through airports—and TSA agents would know who I was—numerous times I was told: We are hurting not getting paid, but we are all right. We are going to be a whole lot worse off if we don't get a

wall or a barrier or something built and start securing the border.

We heard from teachers who were saying: We love our kids, we want to teach them, but it is so unfair to the students who are already there to have people brought in and say you have got to educate these, and they don't speak English. And the teachers would say it really did damage, it does damage to those students that we are supposed to also teach. And now, all of a sudden, we have people we have to teach who don't speak English.

There are some school districts that have done a great job of trying to work around that and teach English in an immersion-type setting so that we can help people not be relegated to manual labor the rest of their lives, but help them speak good English so that they can get good jobs.

But we need a barrier in some places on the border where we don't have it, and that is clear. You can't just have a 20-, 30-foot barrier just proceeding along that is stopping the drugs, stopping the sex trafficking, stopping the human trafficking, and then just stop it. Because, as we saw down the Arizona border, the path goes for miles and miles, and it comes right up to the point where the barrier ends, and it goes right around.

In one place, there is a little barbed wire gate that is held to the barrier. This massive barrier is held with a little, probably a quarter-inch, nylon rope. And they leave it in a slip knot so you can open the gate and the drugs can come pouring in that will kill Americans.

Something had to be done. And yet what happened was the President was willing to negotiate, KEVIN MCCARTHY and the Republicans were willing to negotiate, Senator MCCONNELL and the Republicans in the Senate were willing to negotiate, and yet the word from our Speaker was: We are not negotiating at all on a barrier, a wall.

So we continued to have people in the interim, while the government was shut down, continue to die as a result of us not securing our border.

We were told by Border Patrol, every day, there are women who are pulled into sex trafficking. Every day, there are women—often young girls. We are told about one-third of the girls who are brought up to bring them into the United States illegally are raped at least once and, normally, multiple times.

As long as we keep our border so unsecured, that is going to continue. I mean, how much lack of compassion do you have to have to say: “We are fine with the rape trees; we are fine with one-third of the girls coming into the United States illegally having been raped. We are fine. We just leave things like they are. That is fine, but we are not going to negotiate because.

Apparently, from what we are hearing, even though many of the people who refuse to negotiate have talked about the need for barriers and talked

about the need for securing the border, they were very concerned that the President would get a political win by getting even part of a wall or barrier. So people are just going to have to keep suffering, getting raped and dying.

So we didn't secure the border, there is no additional wall, so they can claim the President didn't keep his promise on the wall. That was more important than saving lives, saving rapes from happening. It is all about politics.

And that is not across the aisle. I have talked to too many friends across the aisle that, if we had been left to our own resources, we could have worked something out.

□ 1500

But apparently, at the top, it was more important to keep a political win from the President than it was to do what was right for the country.

I don't know anybody on our side of the aisle who loves shutdowns, but there were some claims made in the bill that went too far, so most of us voted "no."

We don't want a shutdown, the same way we don't want anybody in our military dying. But, if we never had any military willing to risk their lives, we wouldn't have the freedoms we have today.

If we didn't have a President willing to put a stake in the sand and say: We have got to do something to secure our border. We need some barrier, wall, whatever you want to call it in some places. And I will negotiate. The amount is negotiable—he came down to about a fifth of what he had been saying and what we are told really needs to be spent, \$25 billion or so. Yet there was no negotiation on the other side.

I know there was one dollar mentioned, apparently in jest: Oh, I would give a dollar for a wall.

But it just seems so hypocritical to have a leader, or leaders, that would not negotiate in good faith, which caused a shutdown, with one side willing to negotiate on everything except we have got to have some barriers someplace and no negotiation on the other side.

Then we come in here with a bill today to condemn shutdowns that were caused by a refusal of one side to negotiate. Like I said, I know that is not the case.

There is an article here from the Washington Examiner, Anna Giaritelli. It says: "House Republicans say at least 60 Democratic lawmakers have indicated in the past few weeks that they support some type of barrier, wall, or fence at the U.S.-Mexico border, even as Democratic leaders say they won't agree to President Trump's border wall."

It is just amazing that that ends up being the climactic bill today, condemning shutdowns, after the leadership on one side says: We are not compromising; we are not moving an inch. It causes a shutdown; we will blame

that on you. We will even pass a bill. We have got a majority. We can pass a bill, you know, that condemns shutdowns.

They took out the language, thankfully, that blames the Republicans.

But I would like to recognize my very dear friend from Pennsylvania for his comments and observations.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, we are here today to talk a little bit about what we just saw, which is what the gentleman from Texas is talking about, this vote that we just had with the condemnation of shutdown.

Let's just be clear. Nobody—nobody—in this House, whether it be Democrat, Republican, conservative, liberal, anywhere in between, or in the Senate, nobody votes for shutdown. There is no bill that says: Are you voting "yea" to shut down the Federal Government or are you voting "nay"? That is not how this goes.

What happens is we are trying to fund. It is an appropriations bill. And "appropriation" is a fancy way of just saying: We are taking your tax dollars, and this what we are spending. This is our priority. This is how we are spending it.

There is a disagreement, and we can't come to an agreement. Nothing happens. That is the problem: nothing happens. So the Federal Government shuts down.

Now, we had a discussion earlier on when I said: Look, we are having this vote today to condemn this horrible thing. That doesn't fix anything. It doesn't solve a thing. It is just theater. And the American people and our country have big issues at stake that we need to get to solving. This doesn't solve anything.

This is just: Let's make sure we place blame where we think blame is so we can pound our chest and feel good and we can—oh, by the way—cover for some of our Members who voted "no" on paying Federal employees who were working. That is what this was all about.

It is in the past. It is in the past. But right now we should be talking about the negotiation which caused this whole thing in the first place.

Quite honestly, you should be able to talk and chew gum at the same time, which is: Let's have a discussion about what is appropriate at the border and keep all of the Federal Government open at the same time. But, no, we can't do that because we are not interested in securing our border.

That is really what this is all about. This is the Homeland Security appropriations bill. And if you are not talking about securing the border in the Homeland Security appropriations bill, I don't know where you are going to talk about it.

So, again, no one wants a shutdown. No one voted for a shutdown.

But I reminded the majority party that, in December, this House, under

Republican leadership, voted for a bill that would have kept the government open and, in walking and chewing gum at the same time, provided for border security that the President would have signed.

The majority leader said: You guys voted on a bill after waiting for a year that you knew couldn't pass.

Well, during that period of a year, the reason it couldn't pass is the reason it didn't pass in the Senate: because Senate Democrats refused to fund border security.

Now, I believe they are for border security, but if it says "the wall," well, that is President Trump, and we certainly can't have any of that. I would say we have got to get past that.

Look, you can dislike the President all you want. That is your prerogative. But don't translate your dislike for the President into not caring for the security of the American people. And that is what has happened here.

We are now in January, at the end of January. We don't know what the numbers for January are. We don't know the numbers for December yet. But Homeland Security reported in November, between the ports of entry, between the points of entry, 51,000 people were apprehended coming across our border. We don't know how many weren't apprehended. We just know we got 51,000.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say: We are for border security, so we want some drones and more technology and beef up the points of entry.

We are not opposed to that, but we are saying, generally, that is status quo, right? We are talking about fixing the status quo. We are not talking about doing anything in between the points of entry, which is what the discussion really is all about.

And the President is willing to do things at the points of entry and in between, but some folks are not, and that is where we are having a problem.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman mentioned the 51,000. That is just, as I understand, those who were apprehended.

Mr. PERRY. In 1 month.

Mr. GOHMERT. In 1 month. That is not everybody that was coming in.

My friend, being a general in the United States Army, served our country so meritoriously. We had a situation under President Woodrow Wilson where a small part of Pancho Villa's gang came across the border into the United States, killed some families, and then went back into Mexico.

Devout Democrat that Woodrow Wilson was, he apparently saw that small incursion as an invasion. He sent—and I have asked the Congressional Research Service for their best numbers, and the estimate, taken from articles and information they had gotten, was probably around 75,000 of a new group called the National Guard—new back in the early 1900s.

He sent them down to stand guard on the border—75,000—and sent General John Pershing down into Mexico pursuing Pancho Villa's troops. They

didn't ever get him; they got a lot of his lieutenants. But, apparently, when 75,000 people were put on the border, there was no more invasion.

If you look at the U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 4—this is our Constitution—says: “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion.”

Now, 51,000 in a month is many, many times more than the folks that Pancho Villa had come in and kill Americans. Would the gentleman consider that an invasion, what we have going on on our southern border?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I am not sure what else to call it.

We are a generous people, and I, myself, am the product of legal immigration through Ellis Island. We want to remain that way. The United States is the most generous nation on the planet in that regard, I think last year admitting, legally, about 1.7 million people into our country.

All we are saying is: Listen, please just knock on the door. We have a process here. We have got to do it the right way. Don't just barge in. Just ring the doorbell.

But these folks are saying: Well, we don't want to ring the doorbell.

You can clearly see why, if you are trafficking in little girls or young men, if you are trafficking in the 90-plus percent of heroin coming across the border and into every single town, laced with fentanyl.

If you are trafficking in MS-13, you are not going to go to the point of entry and say: “Hey, Mr. Border Patrolman, I have got this stash of drugs here. You don't mind if I bring this into your country.” No, you are going to go where they are not.

The President is saying this is where we need to secure our border as well, as well as the points of entry.

Again, I don't understand why we are in this mutually exclusive position. I don't think that Democrats don't want to secure the border, but securing the border has to be more, something more than putting a drone up in the sky so that we can see them coming.

The point is that they don't get across the border, not just to see them coming, but that they don't get onto our side of the border with whatever they are bringing and that we interdict them. That is the issue here.

So I think we should be closer than we are, and I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to just appeal to their better angels.

We don't have to side with the cartels. Republicans and Democrats can be together and siding with the American people and securing America and its people from this unsafe circumstance, whether it is gang members and gang-related violence, whether it is drugs coming into our community, or wheth-

er it is low-skilled labor that puts our low-skilled labor—there are people in America, believe it or not, who don't graduate high school, and they have a hard time finding a job because they don't have an education.

Not only are they competing against the things that they have in their own circumstance—right?—of not having an education in their own country, but now they are competing against other people who don't have a high school education from another country, who are willing to work for less than they are.

If we don't stand up for the least of those in our community who have the least, who have the worst disadvantage against them, our constituents, who is going to?

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: It is really time to stop with the theater here and the blame game. It is what it is now. Nobody votes for a shutdown. Nobody votes for a shutdown. But stop with all that, and let's get to real, live negotiations.

You don't have to side with the cartels. You can side with the American citizens. You don't even have to consider it siding with the President of the United States if you find that unpalatable. You can side with the citizens in your community who don't want MS-13, who don't want heroin, who don't want fentanyl, who don't want people stealing their wages from the citizens in their community.

So I would just appeal to them. I know their heart is good, so we just ask them to negotiate in good faith.

The good gentleman from Texas and I will be here when they come up with their plan. We have asked—right?—for 30-some days: What is your plan? We know you don't like the President. We got that. But what is your plan? Have we seen it? I haven't seen anything yet, right? I haven't seen their proposal yet.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I do want to hit one point that the gentleman made about the drones. They can help. The television cameras, all of the sophistication, the technology, can help.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was not here when \$8 billion, as I recall, was passed in the House and Senate, signed by the President, and given to protect our southern border for, the terminology I recall, a virtual wall. And that was not a wall but cameras, airplanes, drones, whatever they could get, whatever they needed, whether it was microphones, listening—it was whatever the Secretary of Homeland Security thought appropriate.

There was a provision that was added in the Senate that became part of the law that said, if the Secretary of Homeland Security decides that money is not going to accomplish the purpose of securing the border, then she can wave that off and spend the money elsewhere.

That is what Secretary Napolitano did, as I recall. She waved it off.

I have been trying to find out for a number of years now: Where did that \$8 billion go that was supposed to be for this technology that we are hearing from some across the aisle: That is all we need is that?

Well, not one single Democrat did I ever hear say: Do you know what? Napolitano shouldn't have waved off a virtual wall.

□ 1515

They agreed that just wasn't going to do it. Secretary Napolitano said that is not going to do it. That is not going to help secure the border.

That is all we hear in response to President Trump saying wall, barrier. Whatever you want to call it, it is what we need there.

I yield to my friend, Mr. PERRY.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I can't speak to what happened in the past, and I don't know where the money went either, but I know where we are today.

I know that our communities are in peril for these issues that we have discussed already. I am sure, coming from Texas, you can name people's names. I can name people who have been murdered, who have died of overdoses. Even if you are just an average taxpaying citizen in Pennsylvania—I don't know about other States—but in Pennsylvania, we pay at least \$1.3 billion annually just for illegal immigration in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that doesn't include healthcare and social services. That is education and incarceration. And we are 2,000 miles from the border.

If you are a senior citizen in Pennsylvania, where our property taxes are high, you have paid your mortgage, you are no longer working, you are on a fixed income, you are counting on your retirement and maybe your Social Security and your savings, and the price tag keeps going up because people keep coming into your community illegally. You are in peril of losing your home, you are looking to your representatives and saying: Sir, ma'am, what are you doing about this problem? We cannot accept this. We don't want to lose our home to pay for this problem that shouldn't be happening.

Regardless of what happened in the past, I can't fix that. But what we are saying in this House, as Republicans, is the status quo of 51,000 people in 1 month getting caught between the entry points cannot continue. It is too much. It must be stopped. We must do something.

If the other side has a better plan, God bless them. I am ready to sit down and look at it, but we have been waiting for it since December 20-something. It is now the end of January. We are prepared. The gentleman from Texas, the Representative from Texas, and I are willing to consider whatever they have, but we don't have anything so far.

This President has offered, I think, four or five times things that they

have wanted and said: Let's come to the table.

We can't fix it on our own. We need their involvement. We need their input.

We just beseech them: Let's get past all this theater. Let's get down to brass tacks here and start saving our community.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania so much for sharing his thoughts. It continues to be a problem every day.

An article here from *The Hill*, by Madison Gesiotto, says: "The Mexican Government is doing more to combat illegal immigration into the United States than the entire Democratic Party put together. While the Democrats continue to pretend the crisis on our southern border is imaginary, Mexico is heavily investing in border security in anticipation of yet another massive caravan of migrants heading for the United States."

It goes on: "Hundreds of Honduran migrants began their journey in hopes of seeking asylum at our southern border, a goal that proved elusive to the previous caravan. Instead of dismissing the new caravan as a 'manufactured crisis' as the Democrats did after President Trump made his appeal . . . Mexican authorities sprang into action, announcing a list of strengthened requirements to address the problem."

"According to the latest reports, the Mexican Government is reinforcing all the entry points along its own southern border with additional immigration enforcement agents and is stepping up surveillance of known illegal crossing points. It also plans to enforce strict immigration protocols, such as requiring the migrants to undergo biometric scans and acquire immigration documents before they can enter the country."

So that is Mexico. We have worked on a bill in the past that said, if you think the Mexican law is so much better than ours, why don't we just adopt the policies and the laws of Mexico, with regard to immigration? The bottom line is, if we were to do that, we wouldn't have millions of illegal immigrants in this country.

I have to give the President some credit here. When we see this article from Reuters, an unlikely source, it points out: "The United States sent the first Central American asylum seeker back to Mexico through a crossing at the border city of Tijuana on Tuesday as part of a hardened immigration policy, an official at Mexico's National Migration Institute said."

Somebody has been doing some amazing negotiating in order to make that happen, where Mexico would agree to take back some folks who are claiming asylum. As I understand it, we may have more people going back to Mexico, pending their hearing.

As we heard from Secretary Nielsen back in December before our committee, where there are walls and barriers in place, it cuts illegal immigra-

tion by 90 to 95 percent. That is something that works. Nothing is going to work 100 percent, but that is amazing at how well it works.

I now yield to my good friend, Congressman GAETZ.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

As we gather here on the floor, the gentleman from Texas and I would note that most Americans are working on a Wednesday afternoon at 3:20 eastern time. Most Americans are trying to advance their careers, their lives, their families. I am just tragically disappointed at the lack of work going on in this Congress.

I think one of the reasons that we haven't been so productive is that we have not seen the Democratic majority put on this floor what their border security legislation even is. I know what the Republican view is as we head into conference. I know that because Speaker PELOSI, in the White House, told the President we could not pass a border security bill here. Directly following that challenge, we came to the floor. We prioritized our borders, our laws, the rule of law. We prioritized the wages of American families, the safety of communities throughout our country. And we passed \$5.7 billion for border funding for a barrier and sent that over to the Senate.

I just don't understand, Madam Speaker, why the challenge that the Democrats gave Republicans is one the majority is unwilling to meet. If Democrats have a bill, put it on the floor. Show us what the majority's ideas are.

Madam Speaker, there has been a conference committee that has been appointed. It will get together, and I sure hope that conference report produces something that looks like a whole lot of border security, a whole lot of barrier and wall and fencing.

I only can imagine the challenge my Republican colleagues must have, because Democrats know what Republicans want, but we don't know what Democrats want, so it is kind of hard to negotiate.

We have to have a win-win to get out of this system where we seem to careen from shutdown to shutdown and crisis to crisis as a mechanism to gain leverage against one another for our respective priorities. But the right thing to do is to just put on the floor what you believe in.

I know what Republicans believe in because we voted for it. That seems to be a fair challenge back to those who are currently in the majority. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am very grateful to my friend, Congressman GAETZ, for that insightful comment. The gentleman is right. When you are right, you are right.

I would like to comment on something else that has been in the news, and that is the longest war in which the United States has ever been engaged.

For a little history, it took a few weeks for the United States to find out

where the training and preparation for 9/11 came from, and that the Taliban and Osama bin Laden were behind it. They had control of Afghanistan, the Taliban did.

It was an amazing bit of negotiation by President Bush, with incredible help from intelligence and special operations. The special ops people from our military were able to negotiate an agreement with tribal leaders that ended up being called the Northern Alliance. It contained some people who have become friends, people who love their country.

By October, we were putting in about 300 special ops military. There is a great book called "Horse Soldiers" that delves into this issue, and a movie, "12 Strong," although the ending wasn't quite accurate. Our American forces were never to lead an operation. They were to support Dostum in his operations, which is what they did, heroically.

By the end of February 2002, apparently, there was no organized Taliban left in Afghanistan. It had done an amazing job. The heroic fighting of those in the Northern Alliance, the Afghans led by General Dostum, did an amazing job.

We provided some weapons. We gave them aerial—well, there were B-52s flying, but only our special ops guys could call down bombs.

The leaders could tell the Americans: Look, there is a bunker. There is a problem.

They would get the coordinates, call down the bomb, take care of it. Dostum and his folks would go in and clean up. That is how, by the end of October, we had not lost a single American, and the Taliban had been defeated.

Unfortunately, at that point, we became occupiers. We sent in lots of American military, and in the 7-plus years of Commander in Chief George W. Bush, we lost just over 600 precious American military lives in Afghanistan.

During the 8 years of Commander in Chief Obama—I believe, personally, it was because of the tough rules of engagement, and our people not being able to defend themselves until it was sometimes too late—we lost about three times as many people under Commander in Chief Obama as we did under Commander in Chief Bush. Whatever the problem, the buck stops with the Commander in Chief, and we lost three times as many when the war was supposed to be virtually over.

What happened, once we became occupiers, was then more Afghans were joining the Taliban. I have talked with an individual who was part of the inner circle that was being made at the State Department about what kind of government we would give the Afghans.

That shouldn't have been our job. We defeated the Taliban, or the Northern Alliance did with our help. They should have been the ones deciding what kind of government.

The people I have talked to in Afghanistan, friends I have made there,

they said: Look, there is not a much better place on Earth fitted for a federalist form of government where the power is in the states or provinces and in the localities. We don't need a big powerful dictator. We need strong states or provinces.

Yet, the constitution we hoisted onto the Afghan people, led by a man who is now in the State Department once again leading efforts—as I understand it, he is the guy who said let's give them a centrist government.

That is what the constitution gave Afghanistan. The President of Afghanistan appoints the governors. He appoints the mayors. He appoints the police chief.

The people in Afghanistan have said: Look, this is horrendous. This is a formula for corruption. For heaven's sake, at least let us elect our governors, elect our mayors. Let us choose our own police chiefs.

□ 1530

But that is not the constitution that we gave them. But there has been an amendment movement for some time. The Obama administration would not support it because they had some of the same State Department people that said: No, let's keep this corrupt centrist—they didn't say corrupt, but that is exactly what it gave them. And the Afghan people don't like what America forced on them.

The solution is, encourage them. And since we spend billions of dollars there, look, you want another dime? Amend the constitution; allow an election of governors and mayors, local selection of police chiefs. Let's return the power to the provinces.

As my friend, former Minister Massoud, there has said: Look, if you will help us get that amendment done, then whenever America leaves, we have got power back in our local areas. So if the Taliban takes over one province, or tries to take over the national government, all the other provinces can rise up and come after them and kick them out like we did last time.

But as long as we have got this coerced, very centralized government, all they have got to do is knock off a few people at the top; which is why we have people that shouldn't still be in the State Department who are negotiating with the Taliban, not even our friends. Our friends are going to be dead when we pull out because we are leaving all this power for easy reach of the Taliban.

We ought to be negotiating with our former allies, the ones that defeated the Taliban within six months, and get them that amendment, push them to get that, help them have those first elections under the amended constitution, and then get the heck out of Afghanistan.

In that regard, we have a man who is not here on the floor this week, hasn't been in January, named WALTER JONES. He wanted us out of Afghanistan, and he has for a very long time.

He is not going to be around to see that happen is the indication.

But, Madam Speaker, I know there are many of us that love that guy, and I was sad to see him in hospice last Friday. Prayers are with his family, because WALTER is going to go home and be better off. But we miss him.

I was heartened to see our friend, ALCEE HASTINGS here on the floor a while ago. He has been going through a difficult bout of pancreatic cancer; been going through chemo, and I know my friends on both sides of the aisle will continue to pray for and encourage him.

We can have strong disagreements. We don't wish anybody to go through what WALTER and ALCEE have been going through.

One other friend that I spoke to in the last week, she has been in my prayers, Anne Graham Lotz. What an incredible gift to America Billy Graham's children have been. And our prayers will continue to be for Anne, ALCEE, and my friend, WALTER, and his family.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family matter.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I respectfully submit the Rules of the Committee on Armed Services for the 116th Congress, as adopted by the committee on January 24, 2019.

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman"), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report

to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security cooperation and humanitarian assistance activities (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy, and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (a)(2) and are required to conduct oversight in their respective jurisdictions, pursuant to clause 2(b)(2) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of six standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: Army programs and accounts related to aircraft, ground equipment, missiles, ammunition, and other procurement; Marine Corps programs and accounts related to ground and amphibious equipment, fighter aircraft, helicopters, air-launched weapons, and ammunition; Air Force programs and accounts related to fighter, training, reconnaissance and surveillance, and electronic warfare aircraft, helicopters, air-launched weapons, ground equipment, and ammunition; Navy programs and accounts related to fighter, training, and electronic warfare aircraft, helicopters, and air-launched weapons; tactical air and missile defense programs and accounts; chemical agent and munition destruction programs and accounts; and National Guard and Reserve equipment programs and accounts.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Department of Defense policy and programs and accounts related to military personnel and their families, Reserve Component integration and employment, military health care, military education, dependent schools, POW/MIA issues, Morale, Welfare and Recreation, commissaries, cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and military retirement issues.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Department of Defense policy and programs and accounts related to military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance, military construction, organic industrial base, the civilian and contract workforce, environment, military installations and real property management, family housing, base realignments and closures, and energy.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy and Marine Corps acquisition

programs and accounts related to shipbuilding and conversion, reconnaissance and surveillance, tanker, and airlift aircraft, ship and submarine-launched weapons, ammunition, and other procurements; Air Force programs and accounts related to bomber, tanker, and airlift aircraft; Army programs and accounts related to waterborne vessels; and Maritime policy and programs and accounts under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Department of Defense and Department of Energy policy related to strategic deterrence, strategic stability, nuclear weapons, strategic and nuclear arms control, nonproliferation, nuclear safety, missile defense, and space; Department of Defense programs and accounts related to nuclear weapons, strategic missiles, nuclear command and control systems, Department of Defense intelligence space, space systems and services of the military departments, and intermediate and long-range missile defense systems; and Department of Energy national security programs and accounts.

Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Department of Defense policy and programs and accounts related to military intelligence, national intelligence, countering weapons of mass destruction, counter-proliferation, counter-terrorism, other sensitive military operations, special operations forces, cyber security, cyber operations, cyber forces, information technology, information operations, and science and technology (including defense-wide programs and accounts related to research, development, testing, and evaluation, except for those defense-wide programs and accounts related to research, development, testing, and evaluation of missile defense systems).

(3) **Definitions**—For the purposes of subparagraph (a)(2):

(A) The phrase “programs and accounts” means acquisition and modernization programs, sustainment planning during program development, and related funding lines for procurement, advanced development, advanced component development and prototypes, systems development, sustainment planning, and demonstration.

(B) The term “policy” means statutes, regulations, directives, and other institutional guidance.

(C) The phrase “science and technology” means science and technology programs and related funding lines for basic research, applied research, and non-acquisition program advanced development.

(b) **Membership of the Subcommittees**

(1) Subcommittee memberships shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the majority party’s caucus and the minority party’s conference, respectively.

(2) The Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member thereof (hereinafter referred to as the “Ranking Minority Member”) may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) **Committee Panels**

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the majority party, all majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman, and all minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member. The Chairman shall choose one of the majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member shall similarly choose the ranking minority member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) **Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces**

(1) The Chairman, or the chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the chairman and the ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member or the ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall similarly appoint the ranking minority member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the concurrence of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee whose chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman, or the chairman of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the chairman of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman, or the chairman of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the

Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2)(A) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(g)(2)(B) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force, the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in

executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the chairman and the ranking minority member of a subcommittee, panel, or task force.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the chairman and the ranking minority member of a subcommittee, panel, or task force, as appropriate, will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee, panel, or task force may be recognized by a subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee, panel, or task force members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or the chairman of a subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the majority and the minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee, panel, or task force shall be submitted to the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the chairman of a subcommittee, panel, or task force, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee, panel, or task force shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

“Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee, panel, or task force) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, panel, or task force, members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman, subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or the subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force for consideration.

RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other com-

mittee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the chairman of a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member or the most senior minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)(B)(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information

that is received which is classified as Confidential or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or the chairmen of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than January 2nd of each odd-numbered year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

MADAM SPEAKER, Pursuant to cl. 2(a) of House Rule XI, I submit the rules for the Committee on the Budget for publication in the Congressional Record. The rules for the Committee on the Budget were adopted by voice vote at the Organizational Meeting held on January 29 at 9:30 a.m. in 1334 Longworth House Office Building.

JOHN YARMUTH.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

(a) Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(c) The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out these rules or facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

RULE 2—VICE CHAIR

The Chair of the Committee shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Vice Chair shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the Chair.

MEETINGS

RULE 3—REGULAR MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session, if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c) and paragraph (g)(3) of clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

(c) The Chair shall give written notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day) on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 4—ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The Chair may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chair shall provide public electronic notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least three days in advance when Congress is not in session.

RULE 5—OPEN BUSINESS MEETINGS

(a) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the Ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(b) Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) No person, other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Com-

mittee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(d) Not later than 24 hours after commencing a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the Chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such measure or matter and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 6—QUORUM

A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

RULE 7—RECOGNITION

Any member, when recognized by the Chair, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

RULE 8—CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chair or by a majority vote of the Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 9—AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all Committee members at least 24 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for Committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chair and Ranking minority member.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 10—PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(b) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

RULE 11—ROLL CALL VOTES

(a) A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

(b) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a quorum is present for such purpose.

(c) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a record of the vote of each Committee member on each recorded vote shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48

hours of such record vote, and, with respect to any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

RULE 12—PROXY VOTING

No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

HEARINGS

RULE 13—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Such announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 14—OPEN HEARINGS

(a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the task forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

RULE 15—MEMBER DAY HEARING REQUIREMENT

During the first session of the 116th Congress, the Committee shall hold a Member Day Hearing to hear testimony from members, delegates, and the resident commissioner—whether or not they are a member of the Committee—on budget priorities and process.

RULE 16—QUORUM

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 17—QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the five-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to clause 2(j) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) In questioning witnesses under the five-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chair and the Ranking minority member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the Committee members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, the Committee members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

(c) In recognizing Committee members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and

shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section (a), the Chair and Ranking minority member may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or may designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes.

RULE 18—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(a) In accordance with clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee or by the Chair (pursuant to such rules and limitations as the Committee may prescribe) may be issued over the signature of the Chair or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(b) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

RULE 19—WITNESSES' STATEMENTS

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(c) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

RULE 20—COMMITTEE PRINTS

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

RULE 21—COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

RULE 22—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee and to the provisions of the following sections, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to Committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding sections (a), (b), and (c), staff shall be employed in compliance with House Rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

RULE 23—STAFF SUPERVISION

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he or she deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with Rule X, clause 9(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives) and job titles, and, at his or her discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

RULE 24—PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(c) Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chair may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he or she determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

RULE 25—ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) The Chair shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with clause 2(e) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives).

(b) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(c) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(d) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the Ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

OVERSIGHT

RULE 26—GENERAL OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, ad-

ministration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause 1(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of Rule X of the House Rules, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than March 1 of the first session of a Congress, the Chair shall prepare, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, and submit to the Committees on Oversight and Reform and House Administration an oversight plan for that Congress in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall provide a copy of that plan to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and must include any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a member of the Committee.]

REPORTS

RULE 27—AVAILABILITY BEFORE FILING

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the Committee shall be available to all Committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the Committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Committee, either or both sections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chair or with a majority vote by the Committee.

RULE 28—REPORT ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The report of the Committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

RULE 29—PARLIAMENTARIAN'S STATUS REPORT AND SECTION 302 STATUS REPORT

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

RULE 30—ACTIVITY REPORT

(a) After an adjournment sine die of a regular session of a Congress or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, the chair of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives without the approval of the Committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(b) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee; a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made; a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and a delineation of any hearings held.

MISCELLANEOUS

RULE 31—BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 32—COMMITTEE WEBSITE

(a) The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members, other members of the House, and the public. The Ranking minority member may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members, other members of the House, and the public.

RULE 33—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chair subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee.

(b) The Chair shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

RULE 34—WAIVERS

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chair may, if practical, consult with the Committee members on whether the Chair should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 31, 2019, at noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Division Chief, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Bump-Stock-Type Devices [Docket No.: 2018R-22F; AG Order No.: 4367-2018] (RIN: 1140-AA52) received January 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VELA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HECK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BASS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. TAKANO,

Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CRIST, Ms. OMAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LAMB, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SIREs, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BERA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. DEAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CASE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. TED LIU of California, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. PORTER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. RYAN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KIM, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CROW, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TRONE, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 7. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX

of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 860. A bill to protect our Social Security system and improve benefits for current and future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 861. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent surprise billing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 862. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 863. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 864. A bill to support wildlife conservation, improve anti-trafficking enforcement, provide dedicated funding at no expense to taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HECK, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms.

LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 865. A bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 866. A bill to provide a lactation room in public buildings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 867. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to prohibit any individual who served as the head of any element of the intelligence community from acting as the agent of a foreign principal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 868. A bill to repeal the restriction on the use of funds by the Internal Revenue Service to bring transparency to the political activity of certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TRONE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 869. A bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. OMAR,

Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUM- MINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. LAW- RENCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. ALLRED):

H.R. 870. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GALLEGRO (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUM- MENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illi- nois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALO- NEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL- ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. YAR- MUTH):

H.R. 871. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Bears Ears National Monument, to ensure prompt engagement with the Bears Ears Commission and prompt implementation of the Proclamation establishing the Bears Ears National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 872. A bill to reauthorize the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program and certain wildlife conservation funds, to establish prize competitions relating to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking, wildlife conservation, the management of invasive species, and the protection of endangered species, to amend the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 to modify the protections provided by that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 873. A bill to assist employers providing employment under special certificates issued under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to transform their business and program models, to support individuals with disabilities to transition to competitive integrated employment, to phase out the use of such special certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for her- self, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 875. A bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 876. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a plan for the purchase and installation of an earthquake early warning system for the Cascadia Subduction Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastruc- ture.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for him- self, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRI- JALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAP- TUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALO- NEY of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 879. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify the percentages of funds to be allocated to certain urbanized areas under the surface transportation block grant program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal loopholes for major integrated oil companies, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 jurisdic- tion of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 881. A bill to require certain meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be transparent and open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CON- NOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCNER- NEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POW- ELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ROYBAL- ALLARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 882. A bill to provide employees with 2 hours of paid leave in order to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on Edu- cation and Labor.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 883. A bill to grant lawful permanent resident status to certain eligible persons who were separated from immediate family members by the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judici- ary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 884. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently deter- mined by the Speaker, in each case for con- sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. COURT- NEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCNER- NEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 885. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the dischargeability of debts for certain edu- cational payments and loans; to the Com- mittee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAR- SON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Flori- da, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. CROW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFA- ZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GAETZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRI- JALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. MAST, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNN, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 886. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 887. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the "Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. SPANO):

H.R. 888. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KIM, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 889. A bill to limit the use of funds to reduce the total number of members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who are deployed to the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 890. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 891. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes related to family-sponsored immigrants and to reduce the number of such immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to limit attorney fees and penalties in citizen suits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 893. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to direct the Bureau of Prisons to provide certain voting information to Federal prisoners upon their release from prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 894. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for clear title to certain land in Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 895. A bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits program; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 896. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require radio and television broadcasters to provide free broadcasting time for political advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 897. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POSEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 899. A bill to terminate the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 900. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the way beneficiaries are assigned under the Medicare shared savings program by also basing

such assignment on primary care services furnished by nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and clinical nurse specialists; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reestablish the 15 percent corporate rate bracket; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 902. A bill to direct the President to impose duties on merchandise from the People's Republic of China to compensate holders of United States intellectual property rights for losses resulting from violations of such intellectual property rights in China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 903. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 904. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that wages paid to unauthorized aliens may not be deducted from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HILL of Arkansas):

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow members of the Ready Reserve of a reserve component of the Armed Forces to make elective deferrals on the basis of their service to the Ready Reserve and on the basis of their other employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 906. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 907. A bill to clarify exclusions from the definition of a deposit broker; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals only enrolled in Medicare Part A to contribute to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 909. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide parity among States in the timing of the application of higher Federal Medicaid matching rates for the ACA-expansion population; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MALINOWSKI):

H.R. 910. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to provide for in-flight refueling of Saudi or Saudi-led coalition aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing coalition intervention in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BACON, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 911. A bill to require the installation of secondary cockpit barriers on existing aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 912. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 913. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to promote access to life-saving therapies for Medicaid enrollees by ensuring coverage of routine patient costs for items and services furnished in connection with participation in qualifying clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KIM, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 914. A bill to limit the use of funds to reduce the total number of members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who are deployed to Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SBOZZI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 915. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Federal prohibition against stalking in order

to provide protection to friends and co-workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. REED, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 916. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require a certain percentage of COPS grant funds to be used for the salaries and benefits of school resource officers, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 917. A bill to assign the responsibility for conducting prosecutions for violations of the laws of the District of Columbia to the head of a local prosecutor's office designated under local law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain tax-exempt organizations to include on annual returns the names and addresses of substantial contributors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 919. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. SIRE):

H.R. 920. A bill to restrict the transfer of defense articles, defense services, and crime control articles to any element of the security forces of Venezuela that is under the authority of a government of Venezuela that is not recognized as the legitimate government of Venezuela by the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 921. A bill to establish the policy of the United States regarding the no-first-use of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 922. A bill to promote fair and transparent virtual currency markets by examining the potential for price manipulation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 923. A bill to promote United States competitiveness in the evolving global virtual currency marketplace; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 924. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his contributions to civil rights, his loyalty and patriotism to the Nation, and his dedication to justice and equality; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 925. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 926. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to consider the appropriate inclusion of residential manufactured homes in certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 927. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in conjunction with the Secretary of Transportation, to carry out a Sustainable Communities Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VELA, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 928. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify aliens who have served, or are serving, in the Armed Forces of the United States when those aliens apply for an immigration benefit or are placed in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. MAST, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 929. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Michael Ber Weissmandl in recognition of his acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 930. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national standard for incorporating a passive identification ability into all firearms sold in the United States, and to require the reporting of lost or stolen firearms to the appropriate law enforcement authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 931. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a former Member of Congress from serving as a lobbyist until the former Member has met any obligation imposed on the former Member under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reimburse the Treasury for amounts paid as

settlements and awards under such Act in the case of an act committed personally by the former Member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 932. A bill to authorize certain long-term contracts for Federal purchases of energy; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. YOUNG:

H.R. 933. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. HIMES, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CROW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COX of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. REED, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARBAJAL,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUIZ, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CASE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. RUSH):

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States waiving the application of the first article of amendment to the political speech of corporations and other business organizations with respect to the disbursement of funds in connection with public elections and granting Congress and the States the power to establish limits on contributions and expenditures in elections for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol to honor the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient of the Second World War upon death; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Supreme Court misinterpreted the First Amendment to the Constitution in the case of Buckley v. Valeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H. Res. 89. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should grant asylum to Aasiya Noreen, internationally known as Asia Bibi, and her immediate family, due to the persecution she has faced on account of her religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H. Res. 90. A resolution supporting the observation of "National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month" during January 2019 to promote efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of human trafficking and modern slavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 91. A resolution reaffirming the robust commitment of the House of Representatives to the importance of the United States-Greek strategic partnership; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 92. A resolution calling for the immediate extradition or rendering to the United States of convicted felons William Morales, Joanne Chesimard, and all other fugitives from justice who are receiving safe harbor in Cuba in order to escape prosecution or confinement for criminal offenses committed in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 93. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia are a part of the sovereign state of Georgia and condemning the decision by the Syrian Arab Republic to recognize these territories as independent of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. DELAURO:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause, which 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
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. CROW:

H.R. 868.

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[.]

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GALLEGRO:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution

"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. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 875.

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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Amendment XVI

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 881.

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. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress 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)

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 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 Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 886.

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.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12: "to raise and support armies"

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof

By Mr. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress has the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof . . ."

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the US Constitution

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 896.

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. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 898.

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. MASSIE:

H.R. 899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution sets forth Congress's enumerated powers, and the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Page H1305).

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress's Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers granted under article I of the United States Constitution, including the legislative vesting clause of article I, section 1; the power granted to each House of Congress under article I, section 5, clause 2; and the power granted to Congress under article I, section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause I and Article I Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 909.

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. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises . . ."

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 919.

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. SHALALA:

H.R. 920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to "provide for the common defense," as enumerated in Article I, Section of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the US Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the US Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO

H.R. 924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 5 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BANKS:

H.J. Res. 36.

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. KHANNA:

H.J. Res. 37.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.J. Res. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 39.

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. LOUDERMILK:

H.J. Res. 40.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 24: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. ROY.

H.R. 51: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 94: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 95: Mr. TONKO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 101: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 126: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 141: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 180: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 205: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 218: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 219: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 230: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 231: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 273: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 295: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 299: Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. CASE, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CROW, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KIM, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. HECK, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 302: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 303: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 330: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 335: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 339: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 361: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 367: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 372: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 473: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 478: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CASE, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 485: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 491: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 497: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 510: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HECK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 516: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 530: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 536: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 543: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 550: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. VELA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 554: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 562: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 587: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 592: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 596: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 598: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 610: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 613: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 616: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 619: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 628: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 647: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STEWART, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 660: Mr. HILL of Arkansas.

H.R. 662: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 674: Ms. PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 677: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 720: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 724: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEUSER, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 732: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 734: Ms. PRESSLEY and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 748: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GOODEN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 754: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 762: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 763: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 768: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 777: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 778: Mr. PALMER and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 780: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 781: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 784: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. COMER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 790: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 793: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 804: Mr. COHEN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 807: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 810: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILD, Ms. DELAURIO, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 811: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 834: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 840: Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 843: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 850: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 854: Mr. SIRES.

H.J. Res. 5: Mr. SPANO.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. MEUSER.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 12: Mr. ZELDIN.

H. Res. 17: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 33: Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 58: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Res. 60: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H. Res. 72: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 75: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 84: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H. Res. 88: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. WILD, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. KILDEE.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2019

No. 19

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, You are our shield and deliverer. You, O God, are our light and salvation. So we refuse to be afraid. Continue to be the strength of our lives, as we remember the many times You have protected and preserved America in the past.

Lord, inspire our lawmakers with Your presence so that the words of their mouths and the meditations of their hearts will be acceptable to You. Help them to remember that You are an ever-present help for turbulent times, eager to empower those who depend upon Your might.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The majority leader is recognized.

S. 1

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as I have discussed several times, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act is a consequential legislative package that would strengthen vital partnerships and reaffirm our active role in matters of global concern. I am proud to support it. I

was also proud to lay down an amendment yesterday that would allow the Senate to speak equally forcefully on critical subjects in American foreign policy.

The United States is engaged in Syria and Afghanistan for one simple reason: because our enemies are engaged there. Real dangers to us and to our allies still remain in both of these nations. So we must continue to confront them there. Fortunately, we are not alone. We are joined in the counter-ISIS coalition by 78 other partners, and in both Syria and Afghanistan, local fighters are bearing the brunt—the brunt—of the work.

But American leadership is absolutely essential, and that is what this amendment is all about. My amendment is not partisan. It expresses views and concerns from Senators on both sides of the aisle, and it certainly isn't political. I intended it as an opportunity for the Senate to debate and vote on some of the more consequential matters of the day, and I expected this institution to rise to the occasion.

I was a Senator on September 11, 2001. I don't want America to ever live through another day like that—none of us do.

I have also been here in the Senate for the 17 years since—17 years of American engagement in worldwide efforts to combat terrorism. It hasn't been easy navigating American interests through this complicated and troubled region. It hasn't been easy adapting to an entirely new way of warfare against enemies that have proven adaptive themselves.

It is understandable that as we get further from September 11, many would grow tired of our military efforts a long way from home, but as decisions from the Obama administration have made painfully clear, leaving too abruptly carries its own grave risks.

Had President Obama known that ISIS would emerge in the wake of his withdrawal from Iraq and flourish in

the chaos of the Syrian civil war, I suspect he might have done things differently. Perhaps he would not have abandoned Iraq so precipitously, ignored the growing terror threats in Syria, or allowed Assad to steamroll over his now-infamous "red line."

We can't undo this unfortunate history, but we certainly cannot afford to repeat it. So it has been a welcome contrast to see the Trump administration make huge progress reinvigorating our fight against al-Qaida in Afghanistan and ISIS in Syria. Unshackling our military has led to progress on the ground, greater pressure placed on the terrorists, and new opportunities for diplomatic and political solutions that have opened up as a result of the pressure that we have applied.

So what we must remember is how hard won these gains have been. Our response to this progress must not be to take our foot off the gas pedal but rather to keep up those strategies that are clearly working.

Our partnership with Iraqi security forces and the Syrian Democratic Forces have stripped ISIS of much territory in those two nations, but we have not yet defeated ISIS. We have not yet defeated al-Qaida in Afghanistan. Civil wars continue to rage in both Syria and Afghanistan. There are still cauldrons—cauldrons—of sectarianism, extremism, and terror.

President Trump is right that this cannot be America's fight alone. The threats that ISIS and al-Qaida pose are global. That is why many countries are with us in this fight. There is more that those partners can and should do to keep up direct pressure on terrorists and on outside actors who interfere with diplomatic efforts to resolve these wars.

Putin's Russia and the ayatollahs in Tehran need to pay a real price for their attempts to back butchers—butchers—like the Assad regime, Hezbollah, and the Taliban.

We also need to understand that if we withdraw too soon—too soon—we will

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S755

create vacuums in Syria and Afghanistan. We know from experience that Russia and Iran would be only too happy to fill those vacuums.

If we truly care about containing Russia, the battleground is not only on Twitter or Facebook but also in the world of old fashioned geopolitics.

So my amendment would offer Senators the ability to speak on all these subjects. I honestly did not expect this would be controversial stuff. I didn't expect that my colleagues across the aisle would make a partisan stand and try to block this straightforward "sense of the Senate" amendment when it really just restates—restates—what most of us thought was a broad bipartisan consensus about American leadership in the world, but that is what our Democratic colleagues did.

They tried to block it. Democrats objected to a vote on this amendment, apparently because it would expose a rift among their own membership—a division between those Senate Democrats who still subscribe to the vision for America's leadership and their colleagues who have abandoned those principles at the urging of the very far left or are too afraid to take either position—either one. It is quite the split. It shows how caught up my Democratic colleagues are in the partisanship of this moment.

My amendment simply reemphasizes the expertise and counsel offered by experts who have served Presidents of both parties. It is a mainstream amendment with 19 cosponsors, but apparently a significant portion of today's Democratic Party isn't sure—isn't sure—they believe in these principles any more. They would rather try to squash the debate and dodge the vote altogether.

Well, that is not going to work. These are exactly the kinds of issues the Senate should be debating. The Senate has a special role in foreign policy.

Americans are serving in harm's way in Syria and Afghanistan. The American servicemembers, diplomats, and aid workers in those conflict zones all deserve to know whether their elected officials support their efforts or whether we no longer believe their tireless efforts serve our national interest.

Our constituents deserve to know which Senators welcome a thorough debate over Syria and Afghanistan and which are simply trying to duck the debate. Well, despite my Democratic colleagues' attempt, I can assure the American people that they are going to learn precisely that. I filed cloture on the amendment yesterday afternoon, and we will vote on it. Regardless of whatever political contortions the far left may be demanding from Senate Democrats, the American people are going to learn exactly where their Senators stand. Our institution will not shrink from this important duty.

H.R. 1

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, I spoke for the first time, yesterday, on the subject that House Democrats have crowned as their signature effort for this Congress—H.R. 1, also known as the "Democratic Politician Protection Act." Speaker PELOSI and her colleagues are advertising it as a package of urgent measures to save American democracy. What it really seems to be is a package of urgent measures to rewrite the rules of American politics for the exclusive benefit of the Democratic Party.

Yesterday, I gave a brief tour through several of the most bizarre components of their proposal. Today, I would like to focus on just one of the legislation's major victims—the American taxpayer.

H.R. 1 would victimize every American taxpayer by pouring their money into expensive new subsidies that don't even pass the laugh test. In several new ways, it would put every taxpayer on the hook to line the pockets of candidates, campaigns, and outside consultants.

Do you look forward to bumper stickers, robocalls, attack ads, and campaign mail that descend on the country in seemingly endless cycles?

Speaker PELOSI must think you do, because she wants you to pay for these things with your tax dollars. You get the opportunity, with your money, to pay for attack ads and bumper stickers and the rest. This bill creates brand-new government subsidies—government subsidies—both for political campaign donors and for the campaigns themselves.

The Federal Government would start matching political donations the same way some employers match gifts to charity. You would be literally funding attack ads for the candidates you disagree with. How about that—your money funding ads for the candidates you disagree with?

Maybe that is why every Democrat opposed our tax cuts for middle-class families and small businesses. They were counting on that money to pull off this stimulus package, if you will, for campaign consultants.

And for what reason? To increase the competition? Well, studies have shown that incumbents win just as often in taxpayer-funded elections as they do when campaigns are funded with private money.

To reduce corruption? Hardly. Jurisdictions that have toyed with taxpayer-funded political systems have turned out to be replete with misappropriation, personal use, straw donors, and public corruption scandals.

So I remain curious why, exactly, the "Democratic Politician Protection Act" wants to offer the American people's money to thousands of candidates that run for the House of Representatives every 2 years, whether they support these candidates or not. They want citizens to bankroll political materials that they totally disagree with.

But they aren't stopping there. Democrats also want taxpayers on the hook for generous new benefits for Federal bureaucrats and government employees.

Their bill would make election day a new paid holiday for government workers and create an additional brandnew paid leave benefit for up to 6 days for any Federal bureaucrat who decides they would like to hang out at the polls during any election. Just what America needs—another paid holiday and a bunch of government workers being paid to go out and work, I assume, for our colleagues on the other side on their campaigns.

This is the Democrats' plan to "restore" democracy—a brandnew week of paid vacation for every Federal employee who would like to hover around while you cast your ballot? A Washington-based, taxpayer-subsidized clearinghouse for political campaign funding? It is a power grab that is smelling more and more like exactly what it is.

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.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 65, to express the sense of the Senate that the United States faces continuing threats from terrorist groups operating in Syria and Afghanistan and that the precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from either country could put at risk hard-won gains and United States national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the majority leader has put before the Senate an important piece of legislation that reemphasizes our support for our allies in the Middle East, a very dangerous neighborhood that has a tendency to have others drawn into the neighborhood and into the fight. This legislation is comprised of four bills that have enjoyed bipartisan support, but we weren't able to

get them done before the deadline at the end of the 115th Congress.

Each of these four bills speaks directly to our national security interests in the Middle East and the support for our allies, particularly allies like Jordan and Israel. Every day, the State of Israel faces attacks from adversaries in the region, ranging from rocket and missile attacks to various explosives and foot soldiers—namely, Hezbollah, the Iranian-financed and trained effort to try to exterminate the Jewish State.

Israel is also enduring a different type of warfare, this time an economic war known as Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions or the BDS movement. This campaign began in 2005 with more than 170 Palestinian nongovernmental organizations lobbying foreign governments, corporations, and academic institutions to sever all their ties with Israel. In the years since, this movement has expanded with participants seeking to isolate Israel both economically and politically.

For some, their participation in the movement is simply a means of voicing their opposition to Israeli policies in the Middle East—something that at least in the United States, they have every right to do under the First Amendment. For others, though, it is part of a strategy to isolate Israel politically and economically, either to delegitimize the State or to force it to redraw its map.

State-sponsored BDS is incredibly harmful. We have seen support for BDS in capitals across Europe and, sadly, even in the United Nations, where the movement has been supported by countries with questionable humanitarian records, such as China, Russia, and Venezuela. A few years ago, the U.N. Human Rights Council called for the creation of a so-called blacklist, naming companies that do business with Israel. Then, in a report in January, the U.N. Human Rights Council laid the groundwork for utilizing those databases to boycott those businesses, including at least 22 American companies.

It is shameful, really, that the U.N. has chosen to fuel this movement by encouraging countries to boycott these businesses for what they claim are illegal activities, even though that argument has absolutely no bearing on either the United States or Israel. This effort to choke off Israel's economy by ending business ties with other countries could have serious impacts. We want to make sure State and local governments have the flexibility to avoid business with entities that support the BDS movement if they wish.

One of the bills included in the legislation we are considering is called the Combating BDS Act, led by our colleagues Senator RUBIO and Senator MANCHIN.

Before I talk about what the bill does, I want to talk about what it does not do. Nothing in this bill restricts constitutionally protected speech. The law only impacts commerce-related or

investment-related activities in the course of interstate or international commerce. The law does not punish companies for expressing their opposition to Israel or its policies or engaging in anti-Israel boycotts, for example.

What this legislation does do, however, is clarify that State and local governments have every right to counter boycotts of Israel without fear that they are somehow violating Federal law. It assures those local governments and State governments that if they decide not to issue contracts or otherwise do business with entities that are boycotting or divesting from Israel, they have every legal right to do so. This is not a new concept, as 34 States have already enacted legislation to combat BDS.

In 2017, Texas became the 18th State to pass legislation preventing tax dollars being used to support the boycott of Israel. When Governor Abbott signed that bill into law, he said, at the time, "Anti-Israel policies are anti-Texas policies, and we will not tolerate such actions against an important ally."

I agree with his sentiment, certainly, and I believe it is time to provide all 50 States with the flexibility to make this decision to forgo any business that would harm the Jewish State.

It goes without saying, but perhaps we should reiterate that Israel is an important and valuable friend and ally to the United States. It is one of the main stabilizing influences in the Middle East, an admittedly dangerous neighborhood, with aggressors on all sides wanting to literally wipe the State of Israel off the map. Of course, Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. Ensuring its viability is critical to protecting U.S. interests abroad and here at home, and it is important that we support our closest ally in the region.

Passing this legislation is a step to support Israel in their efforts to promote democracy in the Middle East. It takes a strong stance against the anti-Israel and anti-Semitic BDS movement and confirms our longstanding support of Israel. So I look forward to voting yes on this important legislation when the time comes, hopefully, very soon.

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. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the introduction of S. 273 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBERTS. 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. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the Senate is currently debating the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act. These are issues that we need to deal with, and it is really an important time to be talking about these issues.

Really, there are four different things that this bill does.

The first thing this bill does is to go further in providing security for Israel. I think virtually everybody in the Senate—there may be an exception or two—understands that Israel is our greatest ally in the Middle East, that Israel is a great source of intelligence for us as we try to work our way through problems in the Middle East, and that we rely on Israel for the partnership we have there in the things that Israel has done to study and test. Unfortunately, it has gotten to test in real situations military defense systems that will intercept things that are coming at us. As for the whole concept of a bullet that can hit a bullet, which some people thought was such a farfetched idea when President Reagan talked about it in the 1980s, Israel has proven one can do it with our help with regard to some of the technology. It is a partnership. Israel, unfortunately, is in a place that actually uses it to really intercept things that are coming at its citizens, and we found out it works.

Security for Israel is security for the United States. In 2016, the United States and Israel signed a 10-year agreement on security assistance. This bill makes sure that the agreement will continue to have the full force of law. This legislation makes sure that we are giving some concrete aid to help Israel protect itself and to protect its own security.

It also states very clearly that the policy of the United States is to ensure that Israel can counter and defeat threats when it faces its enemies. These are countries and other groups that don't like Israel. It is in their schools, their propaganda, and their commitments as nations to talk about the importance of Israel's not existing. In fact, some of them use maps on which Israel doesn't exist. If you were to look at the educational structures of some of Israel's neighbors, you would have to find something outside of what you learn in school to understand that there even is an Israel. Of course, there is Iran, Hezbollah, and Hamas. There are plenty of threats to Israel and to what Israel and the United States stand for.

This part of the bill has previously passed both Houses of the Congress in slightly different forms. Now it is time for both Houses to pass it in the same form, to put it on the President's desk

so as to further defend and define the things that are there. This is an important thing to do.

The second part of the bill extends our cooperation between us and Jordan. We have no more faithful partner outside of Israel than Jordan. Frankly, that Israeli-Jordan border is critically important in how that cooperation works. We saw what happened when the Syrians looked for a safe place to go, and they went to Jordan. So we have done our best to ensure that Jordan can meet its humanitarian crisis based on what has happened in Syria. The economic stability of Jordan—believe me—is critical to the economic stability of the region. This bill also comes up with new ways to assist our allies when they face these unanticipated situations, and some of these situations last for a long time once they start.

The third part of the legislation imposes sanctions on anyone who does business with the Government of Syria. The tragedy of Syria—the tragedy of the Syrian people, the chemical warfare of Bashar Assad, the barrel bombs that have been dropped in neighborhoods where innocent people live, those being children and senior citizens, and where people are trying to work every day—makes it clear that this is not a country that we should support.

Actually, this portion of the legislation already passed the House by voice vote. We need to join the House with its commitment to continue to put pressure on Syria for Syria to meet the standards that civilization should require of those we deal with. We can't deal with Syria as long as it continues to act in the way it has been acting. It is something we know needs to be done. Hopefully, we will have a vote that will move this further toward reality.

The fourth part of the package we are talking about is another thing that we can do in our support for Israel. There are groups of people who seek to target Israel through a series of boycotts and disinvestments and sanctions. These are usually not governments. They are individuals and institutions that are trying to harm Israel by boycotting any kind of business there.

This anti-Israel activity is shameful. Those who promote it should be penalized. If they want to find out what it is like to not be able to trade, we should show them what it is like not to be able to trade. There are 26 States that have already passed legislation that allows them to deal in different ways with people who have either disinvested in or boycotted Israel. This bill provides some further definition of how they can move forward. Boycotting Israel is unacceptable. That is an important part of this package.

All of these things need to be done, and this is an important time to send that message around the world—that not only our allies inside world can count on us but that our enemies in the world—our adversaries—can also ex-

pect us to do what we should do to support our allies, to defend freedom, to look forward as one amendment that has been offered will do that I have cosponsored to meet our commitments to NATO, to understand the continued dangerous nature of terrorist threats, to be thoughtful as we make decisions that move us further away from the safe havens that those threats have used in the past. This is an important time for us to send the very message that this bill and the proposed amendment do send. I look forward to seeing that message sent first by the Senate and then by the House, with then, hopefully, a signature from the President of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, first, I associate myself with the remarks that we just heard from the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who made some wonderful points about how important the bill that we are discussing on the floor continues to be. I appreciate his remarks and his leadership in this body.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss a different topic, which is that the government has reopened for 3 weeks. It is welcome news that President Trump has signed the stopgap funding measure and has fully paid furloughed Federal workers.

There was an important workforce story that, I believe, was lost over the last couple of weeks during the shutdown—the story about the great news of the American economy. I certainly feel it at home. I know the Presiding Officer does in Utah, as do others, as we head home and see the “help wanted” signs that are up and the people who are looking to hire more people.

This economy continues to fire on all cylinders. It is fueled, certainly, in part by what Republicans have been able to accomplish due to our policy, which is a pro-job policy of tax cuts and regulatory relief. Since the tax cut law that was signed a year ago, this economy has created 2.6 million American jobs in the last year. There is additional good news. I hear it in Wyoming, I heard it last weekend, and I expect to hear it this weekend. Americans are seeing that there is actually more money in their paychecks. There is more money for a couple of reasons. One is that wages are up, and the other is that taxes are down. Last month, there was a 3.2-percent year-over-year increase in average hourly wages. It matched October as the biggest increase since 2009. This wage increase was even stronger for production workers and non-managers, who saw an additional increase in year-over-year growth.

The economy is working well. It is producing more jobs. For 9 straight months now, there have been more available jobs in this country than individuals looking for work. Last week,

we saw jobless claims drop to the lowest level since November of 1969—1969, the year we put a man on the Moon and the year of Woodstock. That was 50 years ago. It was the lowest since then. That is half a century.

Now that this partial shutdown is over, I believe we need to refocus our attention on continuing to grow the economy, continuing to increase wages, and continuing to create more high-paying jobs for American workers. Meanwhile, Democrats seem to want to put the brakes on the economy. They are proposing higher taxes and expansive new regulations.

We still have our work cut out for us. This excellent economic news underscores the need for us to work together to resolve our differences on important government funding legislation. Let's keep in mind that 70 percent of the government is already funded all the way through the end of the fiscal year. Congress still has the job to do of funding the remaining 25 percent, and we need to do that by the middle of February—by February 15.

By signing the 3-week continuing resolution, the President has given Congress the opportunity to come together to secure the southern border and to fund the government. During the shutdown standoff, Democrats repeatedly called for the President to reopen the government. They asked for 3 weeks so they could seriously negotiate, they say, on border security. Well, we now have a 3-week agreement, but time is going to tell whether Democrats are serious about solving this border security crisis and protecting the American people.

A full-year spending deal has to include significant funding for a comprehensive border security package. We need more personnel, we need more technology, and we need more physical barriers.

Security barriers are not the sole solution, but they are an essential part of the solution. That is why the last four Presidents built 650 miles of physical barriers along our 2,000-mile border with Mexico. Democrats, including Speaker PELOSI, voted for all this construction. In fact, the Speaker's home State of California has a physical barrier on the border with Tijuana, Mexico.

Like his four predecessors, President Trump has listened to the security experts. Those four were President Obama, President Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President George Herbert Walker Bush. Four Presidents prior to President Trump listened to the experts.

The experts today say we need 200 more miles of physical barriers strategically located where illegal traffic is surging. Despite the experts' support, Democrats have abruptly changed their position on barriers—changed completely—and they have denied the President the funding he has requested.

Given that Democrats had supported 650 miles of the physical barriers we

currently have, why are they opposing the next 200 miles, strategically placed where illegal traffic is surging? To me, it seems personal, and it seems aimed at President Trump. The American people expect us to solve problems not as Democrats and Republicans but as elected representatives of the people.

The priority is to move full-year Homeland Security Department spending legislation through Congress that provides wall funding. Today, House-Senate negotiators are working to produce a compromise package that can pass with the other six bills and get it done by February 15. This conference committee—a committee of the two Houses—will be meeting later today. Conferees may also add other provisions, including immigration reforms.

Already, the President has offered to extend protections for the Dreamers, who were brought here as children, and immigrants whose temporary visas are expiring. So the President has offered an opportunity and a solution. These modest proposals are an immigration policy bandaid. Yet they could be the start of broader bipartisan immigration talks. From a policy perspective, I believe we are not that far apart.

Americans agree that border security is important and that our immigration system does need reform. The country's safety and security must always come first.

In my opinion, the President is open to reasonable changes to his plan. I believe he has been very willing to compromise. As long as Democrats define victory as blocking President Trump, however, on his key priority, everyone loses, and that includes Federal workers, the American people, and immigrants.

The American people expect us to work together to resolve our differences. This isn't a winner-take-all political game. It never should be. Members of both parties must be flexible. Once Congress passes a full-year spending bill, we can move on to other priorities facing us as a nation.

President Trump has incredible determination to build physical barriers where Border Patrol tells us they are most needed, and the President is right when he says walls work. Democrats supported construction before President Trump took office; they should support it now. The President has presented a path to compromise. Now Democrats should follow suit. All we need to succeed is cooperation. The best position on this negotiation highway is the middle lane. It is time to move to the middle and move forward on border security. By working together, we can produce a winning solution for America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). 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. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Republicans started out the last Congress with one goal, and that is to make life better for American families.

After years of economic stagnation in the Obama administration, too many families were struggling, wages were stagnant, and opportunities were few and far between. Republicans were determined to change that. We knew American workers and American businesses were as driven, creative, and innovative as ever. We also knew we were facing a lot of obstacles, including burdensome regulations and an outdated tax code that acted as a drag on economic growth. So we took action.

We eliminated excessive regulations. We undertook historic reform of our tax bill to put more money in Americans' pockets and get our economy going again. The Tax Code may not be the first thing people think of when they think about economic growth, but it is actually one of the key factors that determine how well our economy functions. The Tax Code can encourage growth and job creation or it can make it difficult for businesses to even operate, much less grow and create jobs.

Prior to the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, our Tax Code was not helping our economy. Large and small businesses were weighed down by high tax rates and growth-killing tax provisions and all the regulatory and compliance burdens that came along with it. Our outdated international tax rules left America's global businesses at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy. That had real consequences for American workers.

A small business owner struggling to afford the annual tax bill for her business was highly unlikely to be able to hire a new worker or raise wages. A larger business struggling to stay competitive in the global marketplace, while paying substantially higher tax rates than its foreign competitors, too often had limited funds to expand or increase investment in the United States.

In December of 2017, after months of work, we passed a comprehensive reform of our Nation's Tax Code. We took action to put more money in American families' pockets immediately by cutting tax rates, doubling the child tax credit, and nearly doubling the standard deduction. Then we focused on improving the playing field for American workers by improving the playing field for businesses. We lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which up until January 1, was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. We expanded business owners' ability to recover the cost of investments they make in their businesses, which frees up cash they can reinvest in their oper-

ations and in their workers. We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century so American businesses are not operating at a competitive disadvantage next to their foreign counterparts.

Now we are seeing the results. Our economy is thriving. The economy grew at a robust 3.4 percent in the third quarter of 2018. There were 312,000 jobs created in December, and more than 2.6 million jobs have been created since tax reform was signed into law. In 2018, we saw the most impressive job growth in the manufacturing sector since 1997, and 2018 also saw 19 States reach record-low unemployment rates. This month, initial jobless claims dropped below 200,000 for the first time since 1969.

In 2018, for the first time ever, the number of job openings outnumbered the number of job seekers. The Department of Labor reports that for 9 straight months, there have been more job openings than people looking for work. Think about that. There were more job openings than people looking for work for 9 straight months. Wage growth has accelerated, which was stagnant for so many years in the previous administration. Wages are now currently growing at the fastest rate since 2009. Small businesses had a record optimism in 2018, and the list goes on.

In human terms, this means job seekers are finding it easier to find jobs—and not just any job but jobs they actually want. Fewer families are having to choose between repairing the car or paying for a child's braces; more individuals are able to put money away for their retirement; more families can afford to take that family vacation or to put money away for their kids' college.

I am proud the work we have done is making life better for American families. Republicans are going to continue working to expand operations for Americans even further, and I hope our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle will work with us in order to make that happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

MILITARY READINESS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to address the state of our military readiness. We live in an uncertain world, one that is perhaps more unstable than at any time since the end of the Cold War.

As Russia increases its belligerence abroad and China invests millions in a systemic effort to undermine us, we find ourselves confronted by strategic competitors in new and in dangerous ways.

For decades, violent extremism was our No. 1 security challenge. While the threat from global terrorism remains a priority, the United States and our ideals are now being challenged by nations seeking to reshape the globe according to their own design. This is a design that does not include the respect for freedom and democracy that

we so deeply cherish. We must not stand idly by and let the rising tide of totalitarianism and autocracy sweep away the free global order that America and her allies have fought so hard to establish and to preserve. As Americans, it is up to us to meet these challenges head-on. That effort begins in the Senate.

Every Member of this body took an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution. There is no greater service to that oath and to the people we represent than to ensure the defense of the Nation. That is why, in the 116th Congress, we must build on past efforts and continue to make the necessary investments to our military. Doing so will maintain the safety and security of our Nation for decades to come.

As a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have become deeply familiar with the warnings that senior leaders at the Department of Defense have been delivering for years. They warn of shortfalls in munitions, soldiers who are short on training, pilots without adequate time in the cockpit, and facilities that are crumbling from underfunding and neglect. Yet, in politically charged times, that message sometimes gets muffled against the backdrop of other debates.

I am concerned that some may not appreciate how serious the issue of readiness has become. While we took a significant step forward with the funding that was authorized in last year's National Defense Authorization Act, we cannot fix this issue in just a single year. The depth of the problem is reflected in the very metrics that the services use to measure their ability to fight.

For my colleagues who may be skeptical about the need to make these investments in our military, I would point to the following facts.

In the U.S. Army, the world's most distinguished ground fighting force, only 50 percent of brigade combat teams are fully trained—50 percent.

In the Navy, which protects our Nation against threats around the globe and defends free commerce on the world's oceans, only 30 percent of ship maintenance has been completed on time since fiscal year 2012. Because of this, ships have been unavailable for training and operations for thousands of days. This has made the already significant workload placed on sailors even worse, and it has increased its risk of a catastrophic mishap.

In the Marine Corps—a critical expeditionary force that is essential for 21st century combat—limitations that have been imposed by reduced training hours and a fleet of amphibious ships that have been cut in half since 1990 have impacted its ability to fight a major conflict.

In the Air Force, there are 30 percent fewer airmen and 39 percent fewer aircraft today than during Desert Storm. With an average fleet age of 28 years, our airmen have a tall task of defending against a range of cutting-edge threats.

Across all services, the physical infrastructure, which comprises everything from soldiers' barracks to runways, has become badly dilapidated. An average of one in four military facilities receives a poor or a failing grade.

This is unacceptable not simply because it means we may not be prepared to defend ourselves should we need to fight against a nation that seeks to harm us but because it is our frontline soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who suffer the consequences when we do not address readiness. Tragically, it is our men and women in uniform, who serve day in and day out—on holidays and at home and abroad—who are put at risk if we do not make the collective decision in this body to support our military by providing them with the necessary funding. These are problems we can fix, but it is going to require us to work together to find common ground so as to ensure that America's military remains the most capable and professional force the world has ever known.

As we debate today in the U.S. Senate, hundreds of America's sons and daughters are standing the watch on every continent while protecting and defending our way of life. They are stationed across oceans, in arid deserts, in dense jungles, and here at home. No matter what happens, we know that they are serving faithfully, each and every day, to safeguard our liberty and our freedom.

It is time for us to show them that they are not alone and that the U.S. Senate has their backs. Let's keep working together so that this year will be remembered as one in which, despite our other differences, we will have agreed on this—that our men and women in uniform should have the resources they need to fulfill their mission and that we will continue to provide for a strong defense of the United States of America.

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. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, as most people are painfully aware, we just went through a 35-day government shutdown. It didn't work for anybody. I am here today to talk about a very simple way to keep these shutdowns from happening in the future. I am also here to talk a little bit about how it fits into the broader discussion we are having.

What I am not suggesting is that we somehow leave the border security issue aside. It is a very important issue. We have to address it. The President has presented a reasonable plan. His plan is, actually, to rely on the ex-

perts to determine what kind of barriers ought to be along the border. His funding of \$5.7 billion that he talks about for these barriers is to fund exactly the top 10 priorities of what the experts are saying, which are within the Customs and Border Protection's "Border Security Improvement Plan."

Along with many other things, I think that makes sense. A structure alone—a barrier alone—is not enough. You have to have cameras. You have to have ways to see who is coming, and you have to have ways to respond to it. You have to have more Border Patrol, and you have to have more technology. He also has more drones in his proposal. He has screening at the ports of entry to be able to stop some of these drugs from coming into our communities—the cocaine, the crystal meth, and the heroin, most of which are coming from Mexico.

I think it is a good plan. I think we should provide him help on this plan. We have a true crisis at the border, no matter how you measure it—whether it is in terms of the drugs, whether it is in terms of people coming over, or whether it is in terms of the human trafficking that is occurring, according to the experts. Let's do it the right way. Let's do it through experts. Let's not do it because the politicians say it is the right thing to do; let's do it because the experts on the border say it is the right thing to do. Let's put the right kind of barriers in the right kind of place. That is what I see in the President's plan.

He is also talking about working with Democrats on some immigration priorities they have had over the years. For the last 10 years, there have been Democrats who have talked about these young people who came here as children through no fault of their own. The President has said he would like to give them more certainty as part of this plan. Let's take him up on that. Why would we miss this opportunity? It is a good idea. It is the right thing from a policy perspective. By providing that kind of help to those DACA recipients—those young people who are now working, who are in school, and who are in our military—I think we can actually also get some Democrats to be helpful, to provide more border security at the same time we are helping those who are here and who are deserving of that help.

The President has also proposed to help people who come from 10 different countries around the world stay here with some certainty for another few years. These are people who are in the so-called TPS program, the temporary protected status program, people from 10 countries where there is war, famine, and natural disasters, and you don't want to send those people back. They are working on that and working on getting their work authorizations. That is what this is about. A lot of employers here are eager for them to stay so they can continue to work for some period of time. So there would be some

security for those individuals, tens of thousands of whom live in States where there are two Democratic Senators, States such as Maryland and Virginia. Those Senators have been stalwarts and advocates for making sure there is more certainty for these individuals. It seems to me we have a good combination here. Let's get it done.

The conferees are talking right now, but in the meantime, let's not go back to a government shutdown. That is not going to help us get to a solution. In fact, I would argue that is not only not leverage on behalf of the President or any of us, it actually works the other way because when the government shuts down, everybody loses.

I am hearing from Senators on both sides of the aisle who say they are fed up with these shutdowns. There is now a building bipartisan consensus that we need to end government shutdowns. I am encouraged because I am also hearing from people around the country about this. There is a bipartisan consensus among individuals about it.

There is an interesting poll out today that will give you a sense of this. People were given three options. They were asked: What if these talks break down? Which one of these three things should we do: shut down the government again; turn to a national emergency, as the President has been talking about, as a possible option; or not do either of those first two but, rather, do the default, which is to have a continuing resolution and let the spending from last year continue? Guess what. Only 9 percent of those polled wanted another government shutdown. Ninety-one percent said: No, let's not go back there. I call that a consensus. I think it is time for us to take action here in the Congress to say: Let's stop this.

By the way, people feel this way because they get it. They know that these shutdowns are a hardship for Federal employees who are furloughed or who are forced to go to work without being paid. They are a hardship for small businesses that can't get government work paid for—work they have done. They are a hardship for taxpayers who want good taxpayer services, such as having the national parks open or having food inspections or having the IRS hotline open, which we as taxpayers pay for.

Of course, I heard from a lot of constituents in Ohio during the last 35 days.

I heard from a TSA officer in Cincinnati who, like most people I represent, lives paycheck to paycheck. He told me he could not sleep at night. Why? Because he had never missed a mortgage payment, and he had to miss one because he lost two paychecks.

I heard about a butcher shop in Cleveland, OH. I actually went to visit it. It is a new butcher shop that just opened. It has an interesting mission. It is a deli and a butcher shop in a low-income neighborhood. They want to provide fresh, relatively inexpensive

but quality and healthy food for this neighborhood. It is needed. It is one of these areas where you hear there is a food desert. In some areas, particularly in inner cities, sometimes there is just not good, healthy food anywhere. Well, this little butcher shop was excited about offering it, but guess what. Because of the shutdown, they couldn't get the required Federal permission to accept food stamps. So they had their opening, and everything was great, but they couldn't complete their mission. Their mission was to help these people have better food.

I heard from others as well. I heard from our Federal prosecutors in Ohio. I do a lot of work in trying to push back against the opioid issue, the heroin and the fentanyl, and the fact that we have these drug rings in Ohio and elsewhere that are causing so much harm. These prosecutors said they couldn't pursue these cases. One said: We can't pay informants during the shutdown. Think about that. We are slowing down our prosecution of human trafficking, opioids, rape, and so many horrible issues we want to address. We can't do it during a shutdown as effectively because the funds aren't there to pursue these investigations.

I heard from Ohio craft beer breweries. These are small businesses in Ohio. I am told there have been about 65 new ones in the last couple of years in Ohio. It is a big deal. It is probably in your State too. These are great businesses. They have not been able to expand over the last several weeks during this 35-day shutdown or to introduce new products, which is absolutely essential to their revenue stream. They come out every season with a new product in order to continue to get folks to drink these craft beers, but they need a permit from the Federal Government to do that, so they couldn't introduce their new products.

By the way, I talked to one of them today. We have been trying to help them, and they told me they still can't get the necessary Federal permits and licenses to do this. Why? Because the Federal Government office is so backed up because of the shutdown. So here we are almost a week after the shutdown, but we are really still shut down for the purposes of these small businesses.

I have heard from the young men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard. In Ohio, we have Lake Erie, we have Coast Guard stations, and we have a lot of great patriots who have been struggling financially as they worked for no pay. By the way, they were determined to do their duty, and I applaud their patriotism.

I applaud the patriotism of all of the Federal workers who showed up without getting paid and did their duty and were proud to do their duty. A lot of these folks missed two paychecks, but they didn't miss a beat, and we appreciate them.

In addition to the impact this shutdown has had on those Federal employees and their families, it has also had a

real impact on our economy. We should pay attention to that.

The Congressional Budget Office just released a report on Monday estimating the economic impacts the shutdown had on our economy. Remember, this was just a partial shutdown. Most of the funding for defense, as an example, we had appropriated, but for 25 percent of it, we had not.

This is what happens: When paychecks don't flow into the economy, when furloughed Federal workers can't perform needed services and are paid after the fact anyway, and when there are sudden disruptions for Federal contractors and other businesses that rely on timely payment from these Agencies, it has a real impact, and taxpayers are worse off.

CBO estimated that the partial shutdown reduced GDP by \$11 billion in the near term, \$8 billion in the first quarter of this year, and \$3 billion in the fourth quarter of 2018. Fortunately, the Agency expects an offsetting increase in economic activity now that the government has reopened and Federal employees are receiving backpay, but over the long term, CBO estimates that \$3 billion will never be recovered in our economy. So it has an economic impact on all of us, and that goes for jobs, wages, and economic growth.

Some of that economic impact, of course, also means less revenue. Is it significant in terms of the overall revenue for our government? Some would say no, but it is less tax revenue to the Federal Government.

The aviation industry was hit particularly hard by the shutdown. The FAA was subject to the shutdown, and many of my constituents expressed concerns about aviation safety. We heard about the long delays at some of the airports. That has an economic impact.

I will tell you that airlines, such as Delta Airlines and Southwest Airlines, reported that they lost tens of millions of dollars in revenue in January. So this is over and above the CBO estimate I was talking about. Delta lost about \$25 million. Southwest lost between \$10 and \$15 million. These lost earnings have decreased Federal tax revenues, of course, to the government. CBO didn't put a price on that, but, in fact, it is even worse than CBO estimates because of the budgetary impacts that lead to some of these revenue impacts as well.

The bottom line is that the lower economic growth and the disruptions for Federal employees ultimately cost taxpayers more than if Congress had just passed these appropriations bills on time and we hadn't gotten into this shutdown.

It doesn't have to be this way. Again, that is why I am working to ensure we don't go there again. In every Congress for the last five Congresses since I was elected in 2010, I have introduced legislation called the End Government Shutdowns Act. I was involved with this when I was on the House side

under President Bush, and now I am involved with it here because I think these shutdowns make no sense. I have introduced it under Republican and Democratic Presidents. I have introduced it under Republican and Democratic control of the House and the Senate. So this is not a political issue to me; this is a good-government issue.

The bill is a very simple, common-sense step that would continue funding from the previous year for any appropriations bill that is not done, and when there is a continuing resolution, as there is now, whenever that continuing resolution expires, we would just continue the funding from the previous year. Some have called that an auto CR. Instead of shutting down, at least the government would continue to operate.

A CR is not the ultimate answer. What we really want to do is to get this place—Congress—to actually do its work and to pass the individual appropriations bills. That is how you reform government. That is how you ensure there is certainty and predictability, particularly at the Department of Defense, where they worry a lot about that.

My bill also says that after the first 120 days—4 months—there will be a 1-percent across-the-board reduction in spending to get people to the table so that appropriators who like to spend money actually have some incentive to not just continue the CR. I think that is important. We would then reduce it by 1 percent every 90 days thereafter if Congress doesn't get its act together and put these bills together.

I think this will help to not just stop shutdowns but also to keep us from having perpetual continuing resolutions. Only through passing these individual bills can we do our constitutional duty—and it is our duty.

By the way, some Democrats have said they are not wowed by the 1 percent across the board after 4 months. They have said that somehow Republicans would like that better than they would. I just don't agree with that. I will tell you, 53 percent of the spending in this category is defense spending. It is not security spending, which is more than that, but 53 percent of it—more than half—is defense spending. It is Republicans on this side of the aisle who talk about this every year, and we have accomplished increasing defense spending. We are not going to want to cut defense spending.

By the same token, some on the other side will feel strongly about their priorities, and some of us have other priorities as well. We all have priorities. This is not meant to be an uneven balance; it is meant to be fair—1 percent across the board for everything.

My hope is that we can pass this legislation. We now have 28 cosponsors in the Senate. More than half of the Republicans are on this bill. We have the opportunity to actually move this forward, I hope, in this current negotia-

tion over the border I talked about and over the immigration policies I talked about. Let's do it.

On the other side of the Capitol, my friend TROY BALDERSON, a Republican Representative from Ohio, and a Democrat, JEFF VAN DREW from New Jersey, have introduced this bill. They introduced it last week, so now we have a companion bill that is bipartisan in the House as well.

You have heard Speaker PELOSI say she is against shutdowns. You have heard CHUCK SCHUMER, who is the leader over here for the Democrats, say he is against shutdowns. You have heard a lot of our leadership say they are against shutdowns. Well, this might be something we can actually get together on and do something about.

My hope is that we can move forward. We hope we can put a common-sense bill in place that doesn't allow us to fall back into another one of these painful government shutdowns. They are not good for anybody.

Let's forge a bipartisan agreement on this funding. We are not that far apart, as I said earlier. Let's be sure we have border security. Let's deal with some of these lingering immigration issues where the President has extended the olive branch. Let's do something good for the people we represent, but at the same time, let's find a will to include in this package legislation that ends these government shutdowns while what happened these last several weeks is still fresh in our minds. Having gone through this bitter experience of the longest shutdown in history, let's be sure we don't let people down. Instead, let's make sure we do not let this moment pass and indeed stop these government shutdowns once and for all.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT
NO. 65

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as you know, today, or very shortly, the Senate is going to be taking up S. 1, called the Strengthen America's Security in the Middle East Act.

Through the Chair, I would say, S. 1 is being offered by Senator MARCO RUBIO, the senior Senator from Florida. He is, as we also know, whip smart, and Senator RUBIO has forgotten more about foreign policy than I will ever know. I have enormous respect for him, and nothing I say today is meant to criticize his extraordinary efforts on this bill, much of which I have supported and will continue to support, but there is a deficiency in S. 1. We can do better by filling that hole.

Once again, Congress is paying lip service to protecting our allies in the Middle East. We are calling this bill a protector of our allies in the Middle East, and in large part it is, with a major exception—because, once again, the U.S. Senate is leaving behind our friends and allies, the Kurds.

It is not the first time the Kurds have been left behind. The Kurds were

left behind when the Ottoman Empire collapsed, and they remained a stateless people. The Kurds were left behind as modern states grew up around them, in Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, where they had no political representation, where the Kurds had no future besides oppression. The Kurds were left behind again in 2011, when allied troops pulled out of Iraq, and ISIS was just beginning to emerge. It is time we break that pattern, once and for all, and the Senate can do it in Senator RUBIO's stellar effort in the form of S. 1.

As I said, S. 1 does some really good things. I thank Senator RUBIO. It will reaffirm our commitment to protecting Israel, certainly our closest friend in the region, maybe our best friend in the world. Sometimes I think Israel is our only friend in the world. S. 1 will strengthen our bond with Jordan, another key ally in fighting terrorism and the humanitarian catastrophe caused by the Syrian refugee crisis. It will combat a radical economic warfare campaign against Israel. Let me say that again because it is important. S. 1 will combat a radical economic warfare campaign against Israel. I support that unconditionally. S. 1 will create new sanctions on the Government of Syria that targets those who have been laundering money to help the Assad regime.

I support all of those things, but with all the respect I can muster, I say, gently, it is a lie. It is a lie for anyone to say that S. 1 protects all of our allies in the Middle East because it will not. S. 1 makes no mention of our Kurdish allies at all. I have an amendment pending—I have offered an amendment, rather, that would fix that.

There are 30 million Kurds in the Middle East. They don't have a state, they don't have a country to call their own. They are not really safe anywhere. As a result, the Kurdish people have suffered tremendously throughout history. They have been subjected to discrimination, massacres, forced relocation, and countless other human rights violations.

Saddam Hussein attacked more than 4,000—4,000 Kurdish villages—not people, Kurdish villages—with poison gas and other chemical weapons during the Iran-Iraq war. One hundred eighty thousand people died. They were murdered. Many more were tortured. Even more were imprisoned. Thousands fled, not that they had anywhere to go.

In the 1990s, Turkish soldiers made a hobby out of burning down Kurdish villages. Since 1984, more than 40,000 Turkish Kurds have been killed. They still face oppression today in nearly every country they inhabit. The Turkish Defense Minister made that clear in December, when he said that when the time comes, the Kurds “will be buried in the ditches they dug. No one should doubt this.” That is a quote.

Through all this incomprehensible suffering, the Kurds have stood by America, and we have stood by them through the decades, through thick and

through thin. The Kurds have been instrumental at every phase of U.S. engagement in Iraq and Syria, every phase.

Going back to the 2003 invasion, Kurdish fighters have been crucial boots on the ground in the fight against Islamic tyranny, and that is just a fact. The parts of Iraq retaken and controlled by the Kurds were strongholds for Western values like democracy and capitalism and multiculturalism. In fact, when allied forces withdrew in 2011, not a single U.S. soldier had lost his or her life in Kurdish territory.

The Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces, better known as the SDF, have been another set of boots on the ground in the fight against ISIS. With the help of coalition supplies, weapons, and airstrikes, the SDF recaptured large parts of Northern and Eastern Syria from ISIS's iron grip.

Four years ago, the Presiding Officer will recall, there were 100,000 ISIS soldiers. Thanks in large part to our Kurdish allies, those numbers today are 5,000. Today, ISIS has surrendered 99 percent of its territory, including its capital in Raqqa. The so-called caliphate fighters are now being held to a small sliver of territory on the eastern border with Iraq near the Euphrates River. Our Kurdish allies deserve much of the credit for these successes.

It is plain to see that the Syrian Kurds have been invaluable in America's fight against jihadists and tyrants in the Middle East. The SDF, Syrian Kurds, controls nearly one-quarter of Syria right now. That is land that doesn't belong to ISIS; that is land that doesn't belong to Assad, a butcher; that is land that doesn't belong to Russia; and that is land that doesn't belong to Iran. More importantly, it is land where the Syrian Kurds know they will be free from persecution and from slaughter.

For a while now, I have been asking my colleagues in the Senate to support my amendment to S. 1. My amendment would promote stability and security for our close friends in the Middle East because it is the right thing to do. It is the moral thing to do, and America's foreign policy has always had a moral component.

My amendment will allow the United States to defend the Kurds in Syria by giving the President—not requiring the President to do anything. It would give the President the authority to use our military as he deems fit to keep our promise and to protect our allies—and all of our allies. After all, the Kurds have contributed to the fight against ISIS, and we owe them some peace of mind as we draw down our presence in the region. As we draw down our presence in the region, it is time to stand up and stand by our friends to make sure the fight stays won.

The threat of U.S. military force has been a major deterrent for the reemergence of jihadists like ISIS and al-Qaida. As the Presiding Officer knows

well, weakness invites in wolves. Our presence has held back Assad, it has held back Turkey, it has held back Russia, and it has held back Iran from gaining stronger footholds in the area. Without assurances of our support, as we wind down our effort in Syria, the Kurds will be left behind to fend for themselves. Without the Kurds, we cannot be certain who will step in to fill the power vacuum in the areas of Syria they currently control. We can only guess, and the answers to those guesses don't look good.

If the Kurds are vulnerable to attack from Turkey or Syrian rebels, they might have to turn to their enemies for protection out of fear. Even if they don't, they can't fight off the Turkish military if the Turkish military decides to attack and pursue the remnants of ISIS at the same time.

To abandon the Kurds now would be unconscionable. To abandon the Kurds now would compromise the security of our allies, Israel and Jordan, and it would risk exposing the region to more turmoil.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to think about the Kurds as they consider how best we can strengthen America's interests and security in the Middle East. It is time we make sure America keeps the promises we made to all of our allies—not just some of our allies, all of our allies—in the Middle East.

Mr. KENNEDY. Toward that end, I hereby offer a second amendment that I am sending to the desk. This second-degree amendment will amend amendment No. 65 proposed by Senator McCONNELL. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator offering the amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That requires unanimous consent because the Senate is in a period of debate only.

Mr. KENNEDY. I hear no objection. May I ask that my amendment be read?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Afterward, I would ask that my amendment be read.

Now I would again ask for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to temporarily withdraw my unanimous consent on my amendment, although I reserve the right to return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consent is withdrawn.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Legislative Drafting Service, which we now know as the Office of the Legislative Counsel. In recognition of the anniversary, I would like to make a few comments about the history of the office.

During the first 130 years of Congress, 1789–1918, legislation for Congress was drafted by Members of Congress, congressional staff, Executive agencies, and outside individuals and groups which sometimes led to legislation that was not always clear, consistent, organized, and well written.

In 1911, Columbia University established a Legislative Drafting Research Fund to conduct research and work toward the better drafting of statutes and sent Professor Middleton Beaman and Thomas Parkinson to Congress to demonstrate the feasibility and value of the use by Congress of a full-time staff of professional legislative drafters.

The positive experiences of committees, Members, and staff of Congress, including the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, in working with professional legislative drafters led to the introduction and consideration of legislation to establish a Legislative Drafting Bureau, including S. 1240, 63rd Congress, which was reported to the Senate on June 17, 1913.

During the debate on the establishment of a Legislative Drafting Bureau, Senator Elihu Root of New York argued in favor of establishment citing the use of counsel by the British House of Commons and stating that “[t]he fundamental idea . . . to give the benefit of a trained, experienced student in the preparation of bills. . . . We need trained and intelligent assistance in the drafting of laws.”

On February 24, 1919, Congress enacted section 1303 of the Revenue Act

of 1918, 2 U.S.C. 271 et seq., which established the Legislative Drafting Service.

The House of Representatives and the Senate were initially served by a single office with two branches that received a single appropriation that was equally divided and transferred employees between the branches to meet special needs.

The two individuals who carried out the demonstration by the Legislative Drafting Research Fund became the first Legislative Counsels of the Legislative Drafting Service with Middleton Beaman appointed in February 1919 as the first Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives branch of the Service and Thomas Parkinson appointed in March 1919 as the first Legislative Counsel of the Senate branch of the Service.

In 1924, the name of the office was changed from the Legislative Drafting Service to the Office of the Legislative Counsel.

The House of Representatives and the Senate branches of the Office of the Legislative Counsel began to evolve separately during the 1930s when the Senate branch, while continuing to meet the drafting needs of Senate committees, began to devote a significant part of the resources of the Office to the drafting requests of individual Senators while the House branch continued to limit the services of the branch to committees of the House.

The House of Representatives and the Senate branches of the Office continued to separate in 1958 when, for the first time, the two branches received separate and not equal appropriations and were officially separated in 1970 when a separate charter was established for the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House by title V of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, 2 U.S.C. 281 et seq.

The first attorneys joined the Office to work only for a session or on a particular project and then moved on to other positions, with Thomas Parkinson, the first Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and John E. Walker, the successor of Parkinson, each serving fewer than 2 years and Frederic P. Lee, the third Legislative Counsel of the Senate, being the first to serve a substantial term of about 8 years.

The career tradition of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate was established with successors to Frederic P. Lee who served the Senate in the Office for their careers or long periods of employment, including Charles Boots—1922–1961, 32 years; Henry Wood—1926–1943, 17 years; Stephen Rice—1933–1950, 17 years; John Simms—1936–1966, 30 years; Dwight Pinion—1942–1969, 27 years; John Herberg—1947–1971, 24 years; Harry Littell—1947–1980, 33 years; Douglas Hester—1952–1990, 38 years; Francis Burk—1970–1998, 28 years; James Fransen—1975–2014, 39 years; Gary Endicott—1981–2018, 38 years; and Bill Baird—2010–present, 33 years, who served as attorneys of the Office and Legislative Counsels of the Senate.

During the 100-year history of the Office, the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate has served the Senate well by providing a steady, reliable source of nonpartisan and nonpolitical professionally drafted legislation for committees, Members, and staff.

The attorneys and staff members of the Office have established and maintained traditions of professionalism and dedication that have helped to provide to the Senate a sense of continuity and institutional memory.

There has been a dramatic growth in the use of the Office by the Senate where, during the 66th and 67th Congresses—1919–1923—704 requests were drafted by three attorneys for an average of 117 drafts per attorney for both Congresses, to the most recently ended 115th Congress—2017–2018—where 72,106 requests were drafted by 37 attorneys for an average of 1,948 drafts per attorney for that Congress.

To deal with its increasing workload, in 1990, the Office established teams with multiple attorneys per team that were responsible for drafting legislation under the jurisdiction of one or more Senate committees which has provided the Office with the flexibility and resources to respond to and meet the growing demands placed on the Office for ever-changing areas and complexity of active legislation.

Attorneys in the Office and the House Legislative Counsel's Office use a uniform drafting style to improve the quality and consistency of Federal legislation and Federal law, including whenever practicable plain English, brevity, consistent organization and terms, and captions and subdivisions to organize drafts and make the drafts more readable and improve the administration and interpretation of and compliance with laws enacted by Congress.

After the anthrax attacks on the Senate in October 2001, the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate continued to draft legislation for the Senate by working in temporary facilities outside the Office while the Dirksen Senate Office Building was decontaminated for 1 month and has since developed an effective long-term capability to deal with emergencies, reflecting the can-do attitude of the Office.

The role of the Office in the legislative work of the Senate is not often acknowledged, but it is understood and appreciated by all Senators.

The 262 current and former employees of the Office have worked very hard over its first 100 years to provide consistently a high quantity of high-quality legislation for the committees, Members, and staff of the Senate.

As the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate celebrates its 100th anniversary, the Office is well prepared to continue to provide the Senate and its committees and officers quality drafting service and sound legal advice with the spirit of quiet professionalism that has been the tradition of the Office throughout its history.

I know that all Senators join me in congratulating the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate on the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a listing of the men and women of the current staff of the Office of the Legislative Counsel be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legislative Counsel—William R. Baird; Deputy Legislative Counsel—Elizabeth Aldridge King; Senior Counsels—Charles E. Armstrong, Ruth Ann Ernst, John A. Goetcheus, Heather L. Burnham; Assistant Counsels—Amy E. Gaynor, Matthew D. McGhie, Stephanie Easley, Mark M. McGunagle, Kevin M. Davis, Kristin K. Romero, Heather A. Lowell, Kelly M. Thornburg, John A. Henderson, John W. Baggaley, Margaret A. Rose, Allison M. Otto, Kimberly A. Tamber, Vincent J. Gaiani, Kimberly D. Albrecht-Taylor, Margaret A. Bomba, James L. Ollen-Smith, Robert F. Silver, Thomas B. Heywood, Christina N. Kennelly, Christine E. Miranda, Kathryn G. Bonander, Philip B. Lynch, Deanna E. Edwards, Evan H. Frank, Maureen C. Contreni, Patrick N. Ryan; Staff Attorneys—Carol L. Lewis, Larissa Eltsefon, Mark L. Mazzone; Director of Information Systems—Thomas E. Cole; Office Manager—Donna L. Pasqualino; Senior Staff Assistants—Kimberly R. Bourne-Goldring, Diane E. Nesmeyer, Rebekah J. Musgrove, Patricia H. Olsavsky, Daniela A. Navia.

CENTENNIAL OF BEAUMONT INN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in Kentucky's oldest town sits a beautiful and historic building on the top of a hill. Beaumont Inn, with its name taken from the French for "beautiful mount," is my State's oldest Southern country inn. The Harrodsburg establishment is a beacon of hospitality with a distinguished history, and I would like to take a moment to mark the centennial anniversary of this treasured Kentucky landmark.

When the main building of today's Beaumont Inn was constructed around 1845, no one could have perceived the incredible future in store, but then again, the location had already had a notable history. An original wooden structure on the site was believed to be the childhood home of John Marshall Harlan, future Kentucky attorney general and Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

For many years afterward, the site served as a series of schools for women, including the Greenville Institute, the Daughters College, and finally as Beaumont College until 1916. The next year, the grounds were purchased by an alumna of the Daughters College, Annie Bell Goddard, and her husband Glave. In 1919, the Goddards opened the new 31-room Beaumont Inn, and the same family has proudly operated this wonderful Kentucky establishment ever since.

Throughout the next century, Glave and Annie Bell's descendants have welcomed countless guests to the inn, preserving this historic building, its picturesque scenery, and the tradition of

Southern hospitality. Beaumont Inn grew, both in physical size and in prestige, even earning inclusion onto the National Register of Historic Places. Some of the new buildings include the Greystone House, Bell Cottage, and Goddard Hall, which honors Beaumont's founder. Not only is the inn a charming destination, but it is also a museum filled with interesting artifacts of Kentucky and American history. Today, the inn is operated by the fourth and fifth generation of the Goddard family, Chuck and Helen Dedman and their son, Dixon.

It is beyond question that quality cuisine is a vital aspect of all Southern hospitality. As a pinnacle of a traditional Bluegrass experience, Beaumont Inn sets a high bar. Visitors are drawn to its main dining room by the famous "yellow-legged" fried chicken and 2-year-old Kentucky-cured country ham. The inn's cornmeal batter cakes are a breakfast favorite. In recognition of its culinary excellence, Beaumont Inn has earned some of the highest accolades in this field, including the America's Class Award from the James Beard Foundation. Visitors can also enjoy a Kentucky bourbon at the Owl's Nest lounge or at the Old Owl Tavern, named one of the best bourbon bars in America. As Kentucky leads the Nation in a bourbon revival, the inn has also become an official stop of the Kentucky Bourbon Trail. These amenities reaffirm the strong bonds between this historic institution and one of the Commonwealth's signature industries. In fact, the New York Times published an article about the storied history of Kentucky Owl Bourbon, recently revived by the Dedman family.

I look forward to my next visit to Beaumont Inn, and I would like to thank the Dedman family for their tireless efforts to preserve this Kentucky treasure. Their stewardship of this historic site and long-term vision helps connect our Commonwealth's past to its bright future. As Beaumont Inn celebrates 100 years of excellence, I would like to extend my best wishes to the Dedmans, the staff, and all who enjoy this beloved institution.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such

annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-08, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$2.150 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,

Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-08

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Japan.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$.375 billion.

Other \$1.775 billion.

TOTAL \$2.150 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two (2) AEGIS Weapon Systems (AWS).

Two (2) Multi-Mission Signal Processors (MMSP).

Two (2) Command and Control Processor (C2P) Refreshes.

Non-MDE: Also included is radio navigation equipment, naval ordnance, two (2) Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Systems, Global Command and Control System-Maritime (GCCS-M) hardware, and two (2) Inertial Navigation Systems (INS), U.S. Government and contractor representatives' technical, engineering and logistics support services, installation support material, training, construction services for six (6) vertical launch system launcher module enclosures, communications equipment and associated spares, classified and unclassified publications and software, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (JA-P-NCO)

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: January 29, 2019

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Japan—AEGIS Weapon System

The Government of Japan has requested to buy two (2) AEGIS Weapon Systems (AWS), two (2) Multi-Mission Signal Processors (MMSP) and two (2) Command and Control Processor (C2P) Refreshes. Also included is radio navigation equipment, naval ordnance, two (2) Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) Systems, Global Command and Control System-Maritime (GCCS-M) hardware, and two (2) Inertial Navigation Systems (INS), U.S.

Government and contractor representatives' technical, engineering and logistics support services, installation support material, training, construction services for six (6) vertical launch system launcher module enclosures, communications equipment and associated spares, classified and unclassified publications and software, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$2.150 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a major ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in the Asia-Pacific region. It is vital to U.S. national interests to assist Japan in developing and maintaining a strong and effective self-defense capability.

This proposed sale will provide the Government of Japan with an enhanced capability against increasingly sophisticated ballistic missile threats and create an expanded, layered defense of its homeland. Japan, which already has the AEGIS in its inventory, will have no difficulty absorbing this system into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support does not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor for the Aegis Weapon System and Multi-Mission Signal Processors will be Lockheed Martin Rotary and Mission Systems, Washington, DC. The Command and Control Processor Refresh will be provided by General Dynamics, Falls Church, VA.

There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require annual trips to Japan involving U.S. Government and contractor representatives for technical reviews, support, and oversight for approximately eight years.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-08

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AEGIS Weapon System (AWS) is a multi-mission combat system providing integrated Air and Missile Defense for surface ships. This sale consists of the modified J7 Foreign Military Sales (FMS) baseline (AWS Baseline 9.C2 along with Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) 5.1 capability). No integrated Anti-Air Warfare capability will be provided. AWS Software, documentation, combat system training and technical services will be provided at the classification levels up to and including SECRET within approved release and disclosure guidelines. The manuals and technical documents are limited to those necessary for operational use and organization maintenance.

2. Hardware includes AWS Computing Infrastructure Equipment, including Blade Processors, Fire Control System (FCS) MK 99, Vertical Launching System (VLS) MK 41, combat system support equipment, logistics support equipment, and the Digital Signal Processing Group. The Digital Signal Processing group will be derived from the Multi-Mission Signal Processor and will be integrated with Lockheed Martin's Solid State Radar (SSR) which is being procured by Japan via Direct Commercial Sale contract. The Digital Signal Processing Group will be capable of BMD mission only. The hardware is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. The AN/UHQ-120(V) Command and Control Processor (C2P) System is a Tactical

Data Link (TDL) message distribution system that provides real-time control and management of Tactical Digital Data Links (TADILs) in support of all major surface ship and shore Command, Control, and Communications (C3) systems. The C2P is a follow-on Technical Refresh (TR) upgrade for the legacy AN/UYQ-86(V) variants 1 through 7 of the Common Data Link Management system (CDLMS). The AN/UYQ-120(V) C2PS has three variants depending on the host site in which it is installed and only uses trusted software. The highest classification of the hardware and software to be exported is SECRET. Identification and security classification of classified equipment, major components, subsystems, software, technical data, documentation, training devices and services to be conveyed with the proposed sale.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary obtained knowledge of the specific hardware or software in the proposed sale, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. A determination has been made that Japan can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

6. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Japan.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT CARDILLO

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to honor the work and career of Mr. Robert Cardillo. On February 7, 2019, Robert Cardillo will conclude nearly 36 years of service with the U.S. intelligence community, ending as Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, or NGA.

In 1983, Robert began his career at the Defense Intelligence Agency, or DIA, as an imagery analyst. He served in a multitude of positions for DIA and NGA, to include Acting Director of Intelligence for the Joint Staff, in which he supported the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is the first time a civilian has ever held that position. He was then selected by the Director of National Intelligence, the DNI, to be the first ever Deputy Director for Intelligence Integration. In that capacity, he was responsible for vastly improving intelligence integration, the principal mission of the DNI as established under the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act. As a critical additional duty, Robert also served as the primary briefer for the President's daily brief at the White House.

From 2014 to 2019, Mr. Cardillo then led NGA as its Director. Under his guidance and direction, NGA provided much lauded geospatial intelligence support to U.S. and allied combat operations in Southwest Asia and around the globe, assisting in the fight against militant extremists. NGA also conveyed key indications and warning during crises in Northeast Asia, the Mid-

dle East, North and Central Africa, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

Highlighting the need to get unclassified data to the warfighter and our allies, Director Cardillo pushed hard for unclassified geospatial intelligence, or GEOINT, to exist in the open. He urged NGA to work in tandem with commercial satellite imagery providers and other unclassified industry partners. His support of innovation in artificial intelligence, automation and augmentation, and his focus on activity-based intelligence set NGA on a course to improve the speed and quality of geospatial and imagery analysis. His attention to the ebola crisis in West Africa and other humanitarian assistance and disaster response initiatives showed the value of human geography to the world.

Director Cardillo was equally successful at forging new multinational partnerships in Europe and Asia, and his outreach to industry, academia, think tanks, and other international partners led to an informal but increasingly thriving global GEOINT enterprise.

Mr. Cardillo was also the first NGA director to emphasize the importance of the Arctic and Antarctica and the first to take on the security, quality, and pedigree of imagery pixels and data, so that the GEOINT enterprise can continue to serve as a safe foundational frame of reference for the entire intelligence community.

Robert led NGA with integrity for more than 4 highly challenging and demanding years, to include the selection of a future headquarters site in St. Louis, MO. He laid the groundwork for a world-class building that will be designed to endure well into the 22nd century and to serve as the modern workplace that his workforce so richly deserves.

Director Cardillo will long be remembered as a relentless visionary who restructured the future of his field to embrace public and private partnerships, data science, and machine learning. His far-sighted vision will continue to drive requirements and ensure that NGA shows the way to a safer United States and a more secure world.

We thank him for his years of service to the intelligence community and to this country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING ROGER DAVID MARSH

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me today to support the posthumous promotion of U.S. Marine Corps SSgt Roger David Marsh to gunnery sergeant. Today I would like to recognize the distinguished service of Mr. Marsh, who passed away at the age of 72 on June 17th, 2008.

Mr. Marsh served honorably in the U.S. Marine Corps for 20 years with a superior record, including combat ac-

tions against enemy forces throughout his career in both Korea and Vietnam. Throughout his time in the Marine Corps, he received numerous awards and citations to include the bronze star with valor. Additionally, he made significant contributions to his community after his retirement from the Marine Corps by actively participating in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion, as well as his 30 years of exceptional service as chief of policy for Webb City, MO.

Prior to Staff Sergeant Marsh's retirement from the Marine Corps, he was selected for promotion to gunnery sergeant. He worked diligently for 8 years to get that promotion. Due to personal reasons, he chose to leave the Marine Corps prior to the 2-year obligation of service and therefore was not promoted. Forty-five years after his retirement, we can finally honor his service and legacy through a posthumous promotion.

The State of Missouri and our Nation were very lucky to have such a dedicated member to the community. Mr. Marsh's extraordinary service to the Marine Corps and time after his retirement were remarkable. His actions rise to the level of service that warrants this unique honor. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Roger David Marsh's life and legacy with the distinction of gunnery sergeant. •

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY FINALISTS

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalist essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the ninth annual State of the Union essay contest conducted by my office.

The essays follow, in alphabetical order according to the finalists' names. The material follows:

MEGAN BENWAY, MISSISQUOI VALLEY UNION
HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR, FINALIST

A problem that is growing rapidly in our world would be the increase in children entering foster care due to the opioid crisis. The White House stated that "in 2016, more than two million Americans had an addiction to prescription or illicit opioids." This shows that there is a huge climb in the amount of people getting addicted. Emily Birnbaum and Maya Lora, writing for The Hill, reported that "the population of children in foster care had risen by 15 percent to 30 percent in just the last four years." This shows that due to opioid crisis, the foster care system is filling up, and they don't have enough homes for the children.

The first solution that could help would be to get more funding for the state to use on children and treatments. There has been funding given due to President Trump taking office; "more than \$1 billion in funding has been allocated or spent directly addressing the drug addiction and opioid crisis" (The White House). A couple ways the funding could be used for would be for hiring more social workers. A lot of the children don't get the attention they need because there are so many cases of children for one person to do.

The second solution would be to make getting treatment easier, not only getting more

treatment homes but also making them more affordable. It could go from anywhere from \$650 to \$250 a day (American Addiction Centers). That's a lot of money for someone who is struggling with an addiction and could be almost impossible to get. With the funding they can invest "in residential substance treatment program[s] that keeps families together while a parent gets help" (The Hill). By doing this the treatment center is giving the parents an incentive to get better and follow through with the treatment.

The third solution that could help would be keeping the families together. In the paragraph above The Hill mentioned a center where addicts can get help but still be with their families. One thing that would be good about keeping family together is "once [they finish their] treatment and are stable, [they] can reintegrate [the people] into [their] old work and apartment and things that will keep [them] clean and not create unsafe circumstances for [their] children to be taken away" (The Hill). This treatment center could potentially decrease the number of children entering foster care by a lot.

All of the above solutions could help drop the number of children in foster care. This is an important issue because many American children and adults are being affected by this problem. I know from experience that it hurts to be a child who watches their parents rely on drugs, and then one day some random person comes and takes the child away. There needs to be a change, and it must happen fast. If it doesn't I'm afraid that many children and adults will be stuck in a solution that could kill them all.

THOMAS BUCKLEY, COLCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL,
FRESHMAN, FINALIST

Abraham Lincoln reminded us that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Today, America feels almost as divided as it was before the Civil War. Partisan news channels and a primary system that favors playing to the base have produced election cycles lacking in civility and meaningful discussion. However, the erosion of respectful political discourse and the increased polarization of the electorate are not entirely the fault of politicians nor the voters who elect them. They are instead inevitable consequences of the First Past the Post (FPTP) voting system we use to elect our representatives.

First Past the Post (or plurality voting) is a voting system where each voter has one vote and the candidate with the most votes wins. While this system is intuitive and simple, it is fatally flawed. Because plurality voting has only one winner, and one vote per person, it is impossible for elections to have more than two viable candidates. Any additional strong candidates will result in the winner earning less than half of the vote. To illustrate my point, imagine a scenario in which there are three candidates: a center-right candidate, a center-left candidate, and a more liberal candidate. If half of the voters are right-leaning and half are left-leaning, the two left-leaning candidates will inevitably split the liberal vote and lead to an easy conservative victory, whether or not more people would have preferred either one of the two left-leaning options. Therefore, to avoid the negative effects of splitting the vote, voters must vote strategically by voting against the candidate they most prefer to avoid electing the candidate they most dislike. Because voters must vote strategically, elections in FPTP systems produce two major parties defined by their opposition to each other. Campaigns become increasingly negative as the parties compete in a "race to the bottom" to vilify the other party's candidate instead of promoting their own positive ideas. This is exacerbated by a

primary process that favors the most uncompromising candidates.

Attempts to address the problems with FPTP voting are being made. For example, Maine recently transitioned to Ranked Choice Voting, a system where voters can rank their favorite candidates rather than choosing only one option. This improves political discourse and favors moderation because politicians must compete for second place votes as well as first choice votes. Ranked Choice Voting eliminates the incentive for politicians to run negative campaigns. It doesn't make sense to dismiss the opposition if you want their voters to support you.

Consequently, campaigns under a Ranked Choice system tend to be more civil, with less polarized electorates. When politicians spend all of their time playing to their base, they have no incentive to compromise with the other side, weakening democracy. Because Ranked Choice Voting encourages civil discussion, politicians are more likely to work with each other on issues that are important to the American people. American democracy is broken. We should fix it by changing how we elect our civil servants.

BRENDANY BYRNE, ESSEX HIGH SCHOOL,
JUNIOR, FINALIST

The greatest problem our country faces is not just a national problem, but a problem that affects the entire world—climate change. Climate change will impact all of the people of the world regardless of race, gender, or social class. If our country does not address this problem, the world will be destroyed. In October, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a report warning that unless humanity drastically reduces CO₂ emissions, the change to the world's climate will become irreversible. Arctic sea ice will disappear. Sea levels will rise to the point where coastal cities will become completely submerged. Extreme weather will become more frequent. Potable water and food will become more scarce. Yet many people in the United States still deny that climate change exists, or they believe that there is nothing they can do to change the outcome. This ignorance and sense of powerlessness is dangerous at this critical point in time because the solution to climate change requires the people of the world to come together and act as one.

Under the Trump administration, the United States has stopped participating in the global effort to stop climate change. Mr. Trump has stated that the United States will withdraw from the Paris Agreement as soon as possible. This is a rash decision considering the consequences of ignoring climate change. Instead of running away from reality, the United States should accept the responsibility of being a global power and rise to the challenge of saving the world from climate change.

To solve the problem of climate change, it will take a large scale effort. Similar to the American war effort during the Second World War, every American will need to get behind the movement to stop climate change, and it is the government's responsibility to lead the people in this struggle. The government needs to issue stricter regulations on the emissions produced by large businesses. Instead of spending an enormous amount of money on the military, the government needs to invest money for scientific research to stop climate change. The government must offer incentives for people to live sustainably or impose a gas tax to reduce emissions. The United States needs to work with other nations to share ideas and solutions. Jobs can also be created from the work that will be required to clean the environment, on the federal, state, and local

level. The public education system has already started educating people about climate change and its dangers. Hopefully, this education will help change the culture so that the American people actively want to address climate change.

In the past, America has proven that it can unify as a nation and tackle global problems. It is simply a matter of Americans seeing the dangers of climate change and realizing that it must be our top priority. We must lead the rest of the world and become a role model for the world. We need to engage the government so that we change ourselves instead of the climate.

CAROLINE CASSELL, HARTFORD HIGH SCHOOL,
FRESHMAN, FINALIST

Xenophobia is one of America's greatest debacles. Defined as the fear of foreigners, xenophobia has unnecessarily increased over the past few years due to numerous factors. America was founded by immigrants, yet we now prosecute those flocking here in search of better lives.

American immigration has always fluctuated due to the extent of xenophobia in the country at the time. During World War II numerous Jewish refugees flocked to America seeking safety from the Nazis. Among these people was Albert Einstein, now seen as one of America's greatest minds. We have seen this occurring recently with the immigration ban on Syrian immigrants. In the modern day, war torn Syrian asylum seekers are denied entrance to America and are left living in overcrowded refugee camps in Lebanon and Jordan. America's policy: keep them out, they may be terrorists.

Immigrants living inside U.S. borders are being denied the right to naturalize. Children of illegal immigrants who used to be protected under Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) are now unsure of their safety after DACA was suspended by President Trump. These harmless people whose parents wanted a better life for their children are denied citizenship due to xenophobia. The act of separating families or deporting innocent children to countries where they are unfamiliar with the language and culture is unjust.

My family lived in Saudi Arabia for six years. Living internationally taught me to be open-minded towards everyone; I attended an international school with students from over 100 nations. Every student was like me, and deserved the same rights. When I returned to the America I was alienated by classmates who posed ridiculously ignorant questions such as "Are you Muslim?" "Are you going to bomb the school?"

The issue at hand is fear. Americans need to open their eyes and educate themselves about the world, not just their country. Only 36% of all Americans have passports, and organizations such as the U.S. Peace Corps, which encourage world connections are struggling to find volunteers. We must eliminate our fear is through education. By educating citizens about the outside world, whether it be by inviting more refugees into our country, sending more Americans abroad to do service work, or having immigrants talk about their experiences, we will be able to reduce hatred and fear. We don't need a wall, we need to tear down our own walls of ignorance and hatred.

Without immigrants, America would not be the extraordinary country it is today. Through history, we have looked down on immigrants, and have created "nativist" groups who yearned to exclude immigrants from their society. Everyone deserves the rights that all Americans have; many do not have the access to such rights in their home countries. By excluding those willing to become citizens, we not only deny them opportunities in this country, but we deny them of

their rights. Let's "Make America Great Again": let's educate each other about the world around us and share our rights with those in search of better lives.

COLLIN CHUTTER-CASEY, BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, SENIOR, FINALIST

Where do you imagine the human race being in 20 years? 50 years? The effects of climate change should be front and center in our minds when fantasizing about a space age world. The human desire for technology and cheap cost of living negates responsibility to the environment. Climate change means more than a rise of a few seemingly insignificant degrees over centuries of human innovation and industrialization; however, the rising oceans and temperatures, animal extinction, and increased natural disasters are the real world effects that cost us an increasing amount of money, resources, and even human lives to sweep under the rug.

One of the main effects of climate change is the rise of ocean height and temperature. According to NASA, a federally funded organization, the sea level will rise 1-4 feet by the year 2100. This is in addition to the eight inch rise in sea levels since 1880. A rise of 1-4 feet in sea levels is comparable to the shallow end of a swimming pool, but in the real world means millions of homes and businesses destroyed on the vulnerable coastline, which cannot be restored as we do with hurricanes and tornadoes. Climate change by itself may not seem to be a huge issue, but the ripple effect it creates causes colossal damage.

When solving these problems, we cannot think of our own lives, but rather future generations. Humans do not have the power to predict the future, but we can shape the future. There are two parts to the solution of climate change: Mitigation and Adaptation. Adaptation is adjusting to the effects of climate change. This plan does not deal with the issue of slowing and preventing climate change, but with preventing the effects of global warming from changing the way people live, even if it does change where they live. Mitigation is reducing the amount of greenhouse gases that are released into the atmosphere. For mitigation to be a viable solution to solve the earth's warming, we need a global plan for a global problem. This means that, as a global community, we need laws to promote and enforce renewable energy (solar, wind, hydro, and geothermal), sustainable houses and buildings, eliminate litter, cut down on trash, cut down on resource use, the list goes on. This intensive process requires a change in mindset, and support and participation from all people in all nations.

Let the U.S. stand where the world knows it to be, one step ahead of others, and carry all nations to the solution of global warming. We know the mass destruction that global warming can cause, and the best solution to counter it. So now let the question we ask not be what we imagine the world to be in 20 years, but what is necessary to get there.

FELICIA DAIGLE, RICE MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR, FINALIST

The world today revolves around our dependency on convenience. We live in a society that works to make our lives easier through inventions like drive-thrus and one-use items. Ignoring the effects of this dependency has resulted in an environmental crisis that seems to be too great to fix. The fact that 18 million pounds of plastic enters our oceans annually should shock our generation and instill a sense of ownership about this issue (Howard). Realizing that plastic dominates most of our consumerism and convenience needs should prioritized re-

ducing its production. The way to treat this issue would be by placing a ban on unnecessary plastic goods and an emphasis on teaching students about our oceans and environment instead of ignoring the problem.

By banning plastic accommodations like straw, bags, and bottles, over 14 billion tons of plastic waste could be prevented (Howard). The United States would be joining other nations like the United Kingdom and India in an effort to reduce plastic waste. The European Commission proposed, "a ban on 10 common items that it says make up about 70 percent of the litter in EU waters. This includes plastic straws, drink stirrers, plates, and more" (Howard). All these items seem to make life easier but they have become the reason for the world's struggles with plastic pollution.

When we share the knowledge about how harmful plastic has become, then we take responsibility about choosing a plastic water bottle because it's easy. I only learned about the dire state of our oceans a few years ago when I walked on the beaches in Santa Barbara and saw plastic Starbucks cups and straws intertwined with the seaweed that had washed up onto shore. From that moment I realized that plastic does not go anywhere but into landfills and if we keep producing more and more, none of our beaches will have no plastic debris. If schools took action and speak about plastic waste, there would be no excuse for our ignorance regarding the planet's environmental state.

Taking plastic pollution seriously, starting by a national ban on straws, bags, and water bottles, would be the first step in the right direction. We cannot undo the past, but the future lies in the decisions we start making today. Plastic, a man-made product, cannot keep killing thousands of sea creatures without our government trying to enforce some kind of change. If the United States does not understand its dire need for plastic reduction, our future generations will never know the ocean with plastic filling them.

PAIGE DEAN, SOUTH BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, SENIOR, FINALIST

Members of Congress, I come before you today to speak about something that is near to my heart. I spend my summers sailing on beautiful Lake Champlain in my home state of Vermont, and every Fourth of July my family and I kayak out into Burlington Bay and watch the fireworks. The lake is part of many Vermonters' lives; from childhood jokes about Champ, our local lake monster, to walks along the shore and trips across on the ferry, our Lake Champlain has been an integral part of the Vermont experience.

But today, Lake Champlain is suffering, just as the rest of America is. Devastating hurricanes in the South are displacing us and flooding our homes and businesses. Droughts and wildfires in the West raze the ground, destroy our property, prevent our crops from growing and force us to flee. Our shining seas are encroaching on our plentiful shores, the water lapping ever closer, year by year, to our front stoop. Summers are getting hotter, and storms wilder. We all know the cause, and what it means for us. Climate change is real. We are experiencing it right here, right now. Science does not lie, and all around our nation we are seeing it firsthand. The homeowners in Louisiana who can't sell because their house is in a flood zone, the farmers in Arizona whose crops are withering from drought, the schoolchildren in Flint, Michigan, whose tap water is unsafe to drink, and those Vermont who can't utilize their lake due to dangerous algae blooms.

Every single thing I have listed has its roots in our own actions. However we twist it, the facts remain: we are responsible for climate change.

There is still hope. If we act now, we can lessen the effects of climate change on our homes and livelihoods. I call now on Congress to pass and support strong and direct legislation to help our environment and economy. Strengthen the EPA! Ensure that this vital agency has the resources and leadership necessary to protect our lands and create real change. Pass legislation tightening regulations, taxing and limiting the production and spread of pollutants, give incentives to alternative clean and sustainable energy companies, move to limit our reliance on oil and gas, and make America energy independent and sustainable. We have thousands of capable scientists, business leaders, policy experts and engaged citizens ready to work on solutions and save our planet. Let them! Work with our allies and neighbors to mitigate climate change worldwide. Rejoin and support the Paris Climate Agreement! Climate change affects our whole planet, and only global solutions and partnership will solve it. Let's work on fostering the clean energy and environmental protection programs of other countries through incentives and aid, especially to developing countries while promoting energy independence.

Solutions are in our grasp, we only have to believe in them, reach out, and grab them. Otherwise, we are doing ourselves, the people of America, and indeed the whole world a great disservice. The world's future, America's future, our future is at stake. Act now.

AYNSA DENBY, ST. JOHNSBURY ACADEMY, SOPHOMORE, FINALIST

FIGHTING FOR WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

In America, woman are still continually fighting for women's reproductive rights 70 years after Roe vs. Wade was passed. While many people agree that women have a right to their own body, many politicians still engage in an unrelenting and increasingly aggressive attacks on women's reproductive health care. They do this by introducing and passing unconstitutional bills that would restrict women's rights, for example by stifling access to essential health care and endangering women's lives. To put this into perspective, this, that means hundreds of women's rights are being taken away with each restriction passed, according to the National Reproductive Rights Organization. A possible solution is the Women's Health Protection Act which would prevent states from passing these dangerous legislations and would prohibit state and federal politicians from imposing a range of dangerous anti-choice provisions that take away women's rights and choice over their own body.

In his first year in office, Trump and his administration have brought an aggressive campaign against women's sexual and reproductive rights to the White House, by limiting women's access to birth control and his anti-abortion advocacy. To understand the administration's emphasis on rolling back birth control access and abortion rights, it's important to remember the administration is filled with people who have a track record of anti-abortion legislation and advocacy throughout the years such as Vice President Mike Pence and Trump's top healthcare advisor Katy Talento. Trump administration's 2018-'22 draft plan for Health and Human Services, for the first time ever suggested the federal health agency will now be "serving and protecting Americans at every stage of life, beginning at conception." this language about conception and unborn children signals a shift toward faith-based decision-making in American health care. But women's rights are not based on the faith or beliefs of the government officials but rather each woman's individual choice, therefore the decision should be up the person whose

body is being affected and not a single groups beliefs.

The Women's Health Protection Act would prevent states from passing these dangerous legislations and would prohibit state and federal politicians from imposing a range of dangerous anti-choice provisions. Senator Sanders needs to expand and protect the reproductive rights of women by continuing to fight and support for The Women's Health Protection Act, and by bringing attention to this continuing struggle for equality and individual choice over one's own body. Senator Sanders also can fight to keep Planned Parenthood funded and covered by Medicaid, as attacking Planned Parenthood remains a priority for social conservatives in our Congress today. As of right now 2.5 million people rely on Planned Parenthood for a range of health care services, like birth control and cancer screenings, and defunding it would change the health of millions of Americans as found in the article "How Women's reproductive rights stalled under Trump" by Julia Belluz. So therefore I am not only asking for continuing support for women's reproductive rights but also the health of millions of Americans.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

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. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 269. A bill to protect our Social Security system and improve benefits for current and future generations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 270. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in

the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 271. A bill to grant lawful permanent resident status to certain eligible persons who were separated from immediate family members by the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 272. A bill to establish the policy of the United States regarding the no-first-use of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 273. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require providers of a covered service to provide location information concerning the telecommunications device of a user of such service to an investigative or law enforcement officer or an employee or other agent of a public safety answering point in an emergency situation involving risk of death or serious physical harm or in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 274. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SASSE):

S. 275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain tax-exempt organizations to include on annual returns the names and addresses of substantial contributors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. COONS):

S. 277. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 278. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 279. A bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 280. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities His-

toric Preservation program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 281. A bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and to prohibit consideration of other matters in the Senate if appropriations are not enacted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 282. A bill to amend the market name of genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KING, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 283. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 284. A bill to provide for a biennial budget process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S.J. Res. 7. A joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

S. 69

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 69, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 104

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 104, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 162

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to provide back pay to low-wage contractor employees, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against providers of health services that are not involved in abortion.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) 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. 225

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 225, a bill to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, and for other purposes.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) 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. 262

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 66

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 66 intended to be proposed to S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 273. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require providers of a covered service to provide

location information concerning the telecommunications device of a user of such service to an investigative or law enforcement officer or an employee or other agent of a public safety answering point in an emergency situation involving risk of death or serious physical harm or in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an important piece of legislation I just filed, aptly named after the young Kansan whose life and bright future was cut short by a senseless act of violence and whose case now is the inspiration for why we desperately need to update the law.

Almost 12 years ago, on June 2, 2017, 18-year-old Kelsey Smith was abducted in broad daylight from an Overland Park, KS, parking lot. Kelsey's abduction was captured on the store's closed-circuit security camera, which left little doubt about the emergency sense of the situation. This was an emergency.

Here is the tragedy. Four days after Kelsey disappeared, authorities were able to locate her body after a wireless provider finally released the call information from her cell phone—4 critical days. Providing location information as fast as possible is absolutely critical to ensure that law enforcement officials can rescue victims in imminent danger of death or serious physical harm and hopefully prevent future fates similar to Kelsey's.

This legislation is the culmination of years of work among legislators at both the Federal and State levels, including industry stakeholders, privacy advocates, and, most importantly, Kelsey's brave parents, who spearheaded this initiative and have advocated to create commonsense reforms that properly balance the needs of law enforcement with Fourth Amendment protections for all of our citizens.

Through their advocacy and tireless efforts, Missey and Greg Smith have helped enact laws, oftentimes with unanimous support, in 23 States, including my home State of Kansas. This law provides law enforcement with the necessary tools to rescue individuals in emergency situations where the threat of death or serious bodily injury is imminent.

The impact of this law at the State level has been real and measurable. For example, in May 2012, one month after the enactment of its State's version of the Kelsey Smith Act, local authorities in Tennessee were successful in saving the life of a child who had been abducted by a suspected child rapist. Because the child was believed to be in imminent danger, the police were able to successfully receive the location of the suspect's cell phone in a window of time that led to the safe recovery of the child alive and before she was assaulted.

In February of 2015, Kelsey's Law helped save the life of a 5-month-old Lenexa, KS, girl when a car with a

baby in the back seat was stolen from its mother. Through Kelsey's Law, police were able to ping that mother's phone, which was left in the car, and, within an hour, the baby was reunited with her parents.

According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the first 3 hours are critical to recovering a child alive. That is why it is necessary that in these narrowly defined, isolated instances in which a person's very life is at stake, an exemption should be made to allow wireless carriers to immediately ping an individual's phone and release to law enforcement the whereabouts of that individual.

Understanding this, my legislation would provide law enforcement with the ability to recover the location of children, other missing individuals, and only in very specific emergency situations; namely, where there is risk of death or serious bodily injury.

Don't just take it from PAT ROBERTS. Public safety professionals with experience in the field support this lifesaving legislation. According to the retired Johnson County sheriff, Frank Denning:

Time is of the essence in these types of incidents and the narrow exception for law enforcement to act with immediacy is key here. For this not to be a Federal law seems unjust to those who have loved ones in harm's way and this type of intervention can and will save lives.

Major Scott Boden with the Johnson County Sheriff's Office in Kansas says:

Over my 22-year law enforcement career with the Johnson County Sheriff's Office, 17 years have been spent in our dispatch/911 center. During that time, the Kelsey Smith Law has been the single most important piece of legislation related to potentially saving the lives of suicidal subjects, assisting endangered children, and addressing live threats when cell phone location is necessary and seconds count. The difference this law has made cannot be overstated and I look forward to the day it becomes available all across this country as a resource to assist first responders in their most critical service saving lives.

Jennifer Lanter, the 9-1-1 director for Loudon County, TN, says:

In Tennessee, we have had the privilege of having Kelsey's Law enacted for several years. There are multiple examples of how utilizing this law has resulted in lives being saved that otherwise would have been lost.

This law enables the men and women that have dedicated their lives to the protection of others to ensure they are able to do everything possible to locate someone that needs help. The benefits of this law being passed at the Federal level will be far-reaching, and countless lives will be saved.

It is not just these individual law enforcement officials who support this bill. The bill is also supported by the National District Attorneys Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major County Sheriffs of America, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Fraternal Order of Police,

and the National Sheriffs' Association. I don't know of any law enforcement organization that has been left out, and if it has been left out, it would certainly support the bill. CTIA, the wireless association, also supports this commonsense legislation.

Just this morning, I received a letter of support from John Walsh, who is the cofounder of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and was the well-known host of the television show, "America's Most Wanted." Mr. Walsh has dedicated his life to advocating for victims' rights. It began with his fight for the passage of the Missing Children's Assistance Act following the abduction and subsequent murder of his son Adam.

Fortunately, for my colleagues, voting for this bill will not take a blind leap of faith. Kelsey's Law is already saving lives in States like Kansas, New Jersey, Nebraska, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Tennessee, Hawaii, Missouri, Utah, West Virginia, Colorado, Nevada, Rhode Island, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Iowa, Washington, Louisiana, Delaware, Indiana, and Alabama. Yes, I wanted to repeat all 23.

Oftentimes, the approval by State legislatures has been unanimous, and that is because Kelsey's Law strikes the appropriate balance between ensuring that law enforcement has the tools it needs to help individuals who are in grave danger and ensuring that the proper checks are in place to guard against government overreach.

My legislation requires all law enforcement agencies to maintain a record of all requests made under the Kelsey Smith Act. This record will include the name of the officer who is requesting location information from a wireless carrier, a description of the request that explains the need for the disclosure of location information, and a declaration that an individual's location information is needed in order to offer him life assistance during an emergency situation that, again, involves a risk of death or serious physical harm.

I stress that nothing—absolutely nothing—in the Kelsey Smith Act prohibits wireless carriers from continuing to operate the robust law enforcement verification systems that they use today in order to make absolutely certain that when a request is made, it is coming from an authorized law enforcement official.

Kelsey was never given the opportunity to attend college or to get married or to have children and experience the American dream that many of us take for granted every day. Yet what she did do was to inspire her mother and her father to make it their mission in life to help educate and empower communities and children in order to help prevent another case like this from ever happening again.

Kelsey's father, Greg, who is a former law enforcement officer himself and a Kansas State senator, said it best when

he quoted President Abraham Lincoln to describe what Kelsey had accomplished:

In the end, it is not the years in your life that count. It is the life in your years.

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to speak on the floor today and to offer what, I think, is a commonsense bill that will help prevent tragedies like Kelsey's. I also thank Senator MORAN, Senator FISCHER, and Senator BLUNT for their strong support and co-sponsoring of this bill. I welcome the President's support as well.

I ask every colleague in this body to consider one question: If it were your children, your grandchildren, your spouses, would you not want law enforcement to have immediate access to information that could potentially save their lives and bring them home?

Let's honor Kelsey's memory by passing this legislation in Congress. I see no reason why it could not pass by unanimous consent.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 281. A bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and to prohibit consideration of other matters in the Senate if appropriations are not enacted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I introduced the End Shutdowns Act. Enacting this bill would go a long way towards avoiding the pain and suffering caused to families from government shutdowns, such as the recent 35 day partial shutdown.

I have been outspoken against President Trump's use of a government shutdown as a negotiating tactic, and—in an effort to take away that option in the future—this bill would initiate an automatic continuing resolution on October 1 if no appropriations bill is passed by that date. The legislation would then stop the Senate from moving forward with any other legislation, outside of an emergency scenario, until Congress reached an agreement on a long-term spending deal.

I am advocating for my colleagues to consider supporting this bill, especially those negotiating on the current spending bills set to expire February 15, to include legislation to prevent future shutdowns in any bipartisan deal reached by that deadline.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 81. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 82. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 83. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 84. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 85. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 86. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 87. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 88. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 65 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BOOZMAN) to the bill S. 1, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 81. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 203(2), strike "crisis." and insert the following: "crisis; and

(3) the United States must recommit to resettling a robust number of refugees to meet its share of the global need to alleviate instability in countries like Jordan, which have absorbed a disproportionate number of displaced people fleeing the crisis in Syria, and reaffirm the responsibility of the United States to resettle refugees as a key tenet of foreign policy.

SA 82. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF, 2019

The following sums in this title are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
 AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS
 PROCESSING, RESEARCH AND MARKETING
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for the “Office of the Secretary”, \$3,005,442,000, which shall remain available until December 31, 2020, for necessary expenses related to losses of crops (including milk and harvested adulterated wine grapes), trees, bushes, and vines, as a consequence of Hurricanes Michael or Florence, other hurricanes, typhoons, volcanic activity, or wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018 under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this title as the “Secretary”): *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide assistance for such losses in the form of block grants to eligible states and territories and such assistance may include compensation to producers, as determined by the Secretary, for past or future crop insurance premiums, forest restoration, and poultry and livestock losses: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, tree assistance payments may be made under section 1501(e) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(e)) to eligible orchardists or nursery tree growers (as defined in such section) of pecan trees with a tree mortality rate that exceeds 7.5 percent (adjusted for normal mortality) and is less than 15 percent (adjusted for normal mortality), to be available until expended, for losses incurred during the period beginning January 1, 2018, and ending December 31, 2018: *Provided further*, That in the case of producers impacted by volcanic activity that resulted in the loss of crop land, or access to crop land, the Secretary shall consider all measures available, as appropriate, to bring replacement land into production: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments received under this heading and applicable policies of crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) or the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333) shall not exceed 90 percent of the loss as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments received under this heading for producers who did not obtain a policy or plan of insurance for an insurable commodity for the applicable crop year under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for the crop incurring the losses or did not file the required paperwork and pay the service fee by the applicable State filing deadline for a noninsurable commodity for the applicable crop year under NAP for the crop incurring the losses shall not exceed 70 percent of the loss as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That producers receiving payments under this heading, as determined by the Secretary, shall be required to purchase crop insurance where crop insurance is available for the next two available crop years, excluding tree insurance policies, and producers receiving payments under this heading shall be required to purchase coverage under NAP where crop insurance is not available in the next two available crop years, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That, not later than 120 days after the end of fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress specifying the type, amount, and method of such assistance by state and territory: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY FOREST RESTORATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the “Emergency Forest Restoration Program”, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$480,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for “Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations”, for necessary expenses for the Emergency Watershed Protection Program related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the cost of grants for rural community facilities programs as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That sections 381E-H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 501. In addition to amounts otherwise made available, out of the funds made available under section 18 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, \$25,200,000 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 502. For purposes of administering title I of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), losses to agricultural producers resulting from hurricanes shall also include losses incurred from Tropical Storm Cindy and losses of peach and blueberry crops in calendar year 2017 due to extreme cold: *Provided*, That the amounts provided by this section are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts

repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 503. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a person or legal entity is not eligible to receive a payment under the Market Facilitation Program established pursuant to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 et seq.) if the average adjusted gross income of such person or legal entity is greater than \$900,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a person or legal entity if at least 75 percent of the adjusted gross income of such person or legal entity is derived from farming, ranching, or forestry related activities.

(b) A person or legal entity may not receive a payment under the Market Facilitation Program described in subsection (a)(1), directly or indirectly, of more than \$125,000.

(c) In this section, the term “average adjusted gross income” has the meaning given the term defined in section 760.1502 of title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect July 18, 2018).

(d) The amount provided by this section is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SA 83. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 336. REPORT ON IMPACT OF INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION AND RISK TO UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN EVENT OF WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM SYRIA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report detailing the anticipated loss of intelligence caused by the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Syria and the risks, including the possibility of increased terrorist attacks, posed to United States citizens in the region, in Europe, and in the continental United States.

SA 84. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON RUSSIAN INTERESTS IN VENEZUELA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall

submit to Congress a report detailing Russian assets and personnel in Venezuela and assessing the probability that Russian security forces or private military contractors of Russian origin take an active role in supporting Nicolás Maduro's efforts to retain power.

SA 85. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ANNUAL REPORT ON CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY INFLUENCE AND PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN UNITED STATES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall, acting through the Director of the National Counterintelligence Security Center, submit to Congress a report on influence and propaganda activities of the Chinese Communist Party, the Government of the People's Republic of China, and the Chinese People's Liberation Army carried out in the United States.

(b) FORM OF REPORTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 86. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE REPORT ON BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on the security implications of the Belt and Road Initiative of the People's Republic of China.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the objectives of the Belt and Road Initiative and the ability of China to meet those objectives.

(2) An evaluation of the security implications of the Belt and Road Initiative, including specific military applications in both peacetime and during conflict.

(3) An assessment of the current and future effects of the initiative on regional economic, political, and security interests of the United States and allies and partners of the United States.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 87. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 501. ASSESSMENT OF COLLABORATIVE INITIATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA RELATING TO SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report assessing collaborative initiatives of the United States and the People's Republic of China relating to scientific and technical cooperation.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the nature of collaborative initiatives described in subsection (a), including how such initiatives are funded, who participates in such initiatives, and the outcomes of such initiatives.

(2) A description of the licensing and regulatory regime under which such initiatives occur.

(3) An assessment of whether the intellectual property rights of United States researchers and entities participating in such initiatives are being adequately protected.

(4) An assessment of whether entities owned or controlled by the government or the military of the People's Republic of China are benefitting from research funded by United States taxpayers.

(5) An assessment of whether any Chinese researchers participating in such initiatives have ties to the government or the military of the People's Republic of China.

(6) An assessment of whether any institutions of higher education, laboratories, or other entities in the United States participating in such initiatives have been subject to cyber penetration originating in the People's Republic of China.

(7) An evaluation of the benefits of such initiatives for the United States.

(8) An assessment of any redundancies among such initiatives.

(9) Recommendations for improving such initiatives.

SA 88. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 65 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BOOZMAN) to the bill S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . AUTHORIZATION.

The President is hereby authorized to undertake military assistance and use of armed forces, if the President determines it necessary and appropriate, to defend the Kurds in Syria against armed aggression from any country or terrorist organization.

**ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
JANUARY 31, 2019**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. Thursday, January 31; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1, and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the McConnell amendment No. 65 at 3:30 p.m. and that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:16 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 31, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MARK SCHULTZ, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE REHABILITATION SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE JANET LORRAINE LABRECK.

ROBERT L. KING, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE EDUARDO M. OCHOA.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PETER G. STAMATOPOULOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GAYLE D. SHAFFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KELLY A. AESCHBACH
REAR ADM. (LH) FRANK D. WHITWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BLAKE L. CONVERSE
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES B. COOPER II
REAR ADM. (LH) DONALD D. GABRIELSON
REAR ADM. (LH) GREGORY N. HARRIS
REAR ADM. (LH) JEFFREY T. JABLON
REAR ADM. (LH) YANCY B. LINDSEY
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. MEIER

REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES E. PITTS
 REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. SKILLMAN
 REAR ADM. (LH) KARL O. THOMAS
 REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN F. WADE
 REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL A. WETTLAUFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GENE F. PRICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SHAWN E. DUANE
 REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT D. JONES
 REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. MUSTIN
 REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN A. SCHOMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ALAN J. REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) TROY M. MCCLELLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DEAN A. VANDERLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH W. EPPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TIMOTHY H. WEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JAMES L. HANCOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. NICHOLAS M. HOMAN

CAPT. MICHAEL J. VERNAZZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHARLES W. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SCOTT M. BROWN

CAPT. CASEY J. MOTON

CAPT. STEPHEN R. TEDFORD

CAPT. ERIC H. VERHAGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JEFFREY T. ANDERSON
 CAPT. STEPHEN D. BARNETT
 CAPT. MICHAEL W. BAZE
 CAPT. RICHARD T. BROPHY, JR.
 CAPT. ANTHONY C. CARULLO
 CAPT. ROBERT B. CHADWICK II
 CAPT. JEFFREY J. CZEREWKO
 CAPT. MICHAEL P. DONNELLY
 CAPT. CHRISTOPHER M. ENGDAHL
 CAPT. ROBERT M. GAUCHER
 CAPT. DANIEL P. MARTIN
 CAPT. JOHN V. MENONI
 CAPT. CURT A. RENSHAW
 CAPT. SCOTT F. ROBERTSON
 CAPT. MILTON J. SANDS III
 CAPT. PAUL C. SPEDERO, JR.
 CAPT. CHRISTOPHER J. SWEENEY
 CAPT. JEROMY B. WILLIAMS

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BRENDAN C. MCPHERSON
 CAPT. DOUGLAS M. SCHOFIELD
 CAPT. ANDREW M. SUGIMOTO
 CAPT. RICHARD V. TIMME
 CAPT. TODD C. WIEMERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2121(D):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MELVIN W. BOUBOULIS
 REAR ADM. (LH) DONNA L. COTTRELL
 REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL J. JOHNSTON
 REAR ADM. (LH) ERIC C. JONES
 REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL P. RYAN

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Monday, January 28, 2019 due to flight cancellations from heavy snow in Wisconsin. Had I been present, I would have supported the passage of all bills considered on the floor. In particular, I strongly supported the passage of H.R. 502, the FIND Trafficking Act, as this bill is an important step forward in preventing online marketplaces used for sex trafficking or illegal drug trafficking.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF GARDEN GROVE FIRE CHIEF TOM SCHULTZ

HON. HARLEY ROUDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Tom Schultz, Fire Chief of Garden Grove, CA. This past weekend, Mr. Schultz died of stage 4 pancreatic cancer.

Chief Schultz devoted his life to ensuring the safety and security of all Orange County residents, spending three decades in the fire departments of Garden Grove, Fullerton, and Brea, CA.

In addition to his day-to-day work at the fire station, Chief Schultz trained and mentored young firefighters through his work as an instructor in Santa Ana College's fire technology program, and he was deeply involved in the management and leadership of the Orange County Fire Chiefs' Association.

I commend Chief Schultz for his years of service and extend my heartfelt condolences to his family and friends in this difficult time.

I ask all members to join me in remembering Tom Schultz—a public servant, family man, and leader—for a lifetime of service to the people and communities of Orange County.

HONORING RANDY RANDAZZO

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Randy Randazzo for his service to the community of Carmel Valley, California. Mr. Randazzo has made a career out of service and has fostered an environment of collectiveness and compassion in his tight-knit community.

As a World War II Marine Veteran, Mr. Randazzo heroically served in the Bougainville

Campaign in the Solomon Islands. He served on the fleet that facilitated the Japanese surrender, signaling the close of World War II. Upon returning to his home of Carmel Valley, Mr. Randazzo dedicated his life to his community. He and his wife, Charlene, have owned and operated the local market in Carmel Valley Village, which has served as the cornerstone for the community. Randy is also active in the local Kiwanis Club, where he works to empower youth to change the world by investing in their futures.

Among his many achievements, Mr. Randazzo has been awarded Carmel Valley's Good Egg award for Citizen of the Year twice for his service to the community. Additionally, he has been recognized by the Carmel Historical Society for his contributions in organizing and establishing the Carmel Valley Community Center. Many called Mr. Randazzo the unofficial mayor of Carmel Valley, as the small, unincorporated community views his leadership as invaluable and irreplaceable.

I am immensely grateful for Randy Randazzo's distinguished service to his country and the residents of the central coast of California. Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Randy Randazzo on his distinguished career and recognizing his outstanding citizenship and immense contributions to both Carmel Valley and the United States of America.

HONORING JAMES BELT AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of James Belt, a native of Harlingen, for his work and service in the great State of Texas.

Mr. Belt earned his Bachelor of Business Administration from the Pan American University, Edinburg, in 1968, and his Juris Doctorate from Thurgood Marshall School of Law at Texas Southern University (TSU) in 1977. After law school, he opened his law practice in South Dallas, where he served the African American community for almost 40 years. A lifetime member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Belt was also a member of the National Bar Association, the Texas Bar Association, J.L. Turner Legal Association, and the American Inns of Court.

As founder of the Dallas Black Criminal Bar Association, he was a well-respected leader and advocate for the advancement of his community, and inspired others to help those in need. He served on the TSU Board of Regents, the Dallas Area Rapid Transit Board, and the Texas Rural Foundation Board. He was the co-publisher of the Dallas Examiner. Mr. Belt received the "Living Legends" award

from the J.L. Turner Legal Association, and was recognized as "Business Man of the Year" by the alumnae chapter of TSU in 2010.

I am pleased to honor James Belt for his legacy of unselfishness and generosity. Mr. Belt's devotion to serving others makes him an outstanding role model for the people of the Lower Rio Grande Valley. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring James Belt, and recognizing his surviving family and friends on this special occasion.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND ANTI-TRAFFICKING ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I reintroduce the Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act with Congressman DON YOUNG (R-AK), the Dean of the House.

I thank Congressman YOUNG (R-AK) for his support as my co-lead and original cosponsor on this important legislation, as well as our former colleague Congresswoman Madeleine Z. Bordallo (D-GU), who sponsored this legislation in the previous Congress.

Around the world, poachers, traffickers, and transnational criminal organizations responsible for human rights abuses are driving iconic wildlife to extinction. The Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act advances American leadership in tackling this global crisis. Our bipartisan bill would strengthen federal enforcement against the global trade in illegal wildlife and seafood products, while also providing dedicated funding for conservation efforts, at no expense to taxpayers.

Specifically, our bill would make serious wildlife trafficking violations predicate offenses under federal racketeering and anti-organized crime laws (RICO and Travel Acts). The bill would also engage whistleblowers, through monetary incentives, in providing actionable intelligence needed to bring down global wildlife trafficking rings. Under our bill, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be authorized to station law enforcement officials and agency personnel abroad in high-intensity wildlife trafficking areas, as embeds in American embassies and consulates.

Any penalties, fines, forfeitures, and restitution paid to the U.S. government for criminal violations of the federal organized crime, racketeering, and money laundering statutes for wildlife trafficking offenses would support conservation efforts. This provides dedicated funding for in-country conservation efforts for highly trafficked and endangered wildlife species, at no expense to taxpayers under our bill.

Lastly, our bill includes provisions to crack down on illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing by foreign vessels or fraudulent seafood imports into the United States. According to the U.S. State Department, IUU

● 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.

fishing often goes hand-in-hand with transnational organized crime, human trafficking and forced labor, and weapons and drug trafficking. American fishermen should never be expected to compete against fraudulent seafood imports harvested with slave labor, especially in the Indo-Pacific region.

Madam Speaker, again I thank Congressman YOUNG (R-AK) for his partnership as the original cosponsor on this important, bipartisan bill. I urge all Members to join us in cosponsoring the Wildlife Conservation and Anti-Trafficking Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LLOYD SMUCKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, due to illness I missed Roll Call vote No. 59. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 59.

IN SUPPORT OF PAYCHECK
FAIRNESS ACT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be a sponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

This Act is needed to stop discriminatory practices by employers against our mothers, wives, daughters, and granddaughters that do the same job as their male counterparts.

It is sad that today in America, women working full-time, year-round still earn 80 cents, on average, for every dollar earned by men.

Women of color face the brunt of the inequality, with African American women earning 61 cents, Latinas earning 53 cents, and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women earning 62 cents compared with white, non-Hispanic men.

This year marks the 10-year anniversary of President Barack Obama signing the Lily Ledbetter Act, which made it easier to sue in cases of pay discrimination.

This legislation that we are discussing today—the Paycheck Fairness Act—is but one small step towards that end.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, will strengthen the Equal Pay Act—passed more than 45 years ago—and as a result improve the law's effectiveness, and help to address the persistent wage gap between men and women.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would:

Clarify acceptable reasons for differences in pay by requiring employers to demonstrate that wage gaps between men and women doing the same work are truly a result of factors other than sex.

Deter wage discrimination by strengthening penalties for equal pay violations, and by prohibiting retaliation against workers who inquire about employers' wage practices or disclose their own wages.

The bill's approach would ensure that women can obtain the same remedies as

those subject to discrimination on the basis of race or national origin.

Provide women with a fair option to proceed in a class action suit under the Equal Pay Act, and allow women to receive punitive and compensatory damages for pay discrimination.

Clarify the establishment provision under the Equal Pay Act, which would allow for reasonable comparisons between employees to determine fair wages.

Authorize additional training for Equal Employment Opportunity Commission staff to better identify and handle wage disputes.

It will aid in the efficient and effective enforcement of federal anti-pay discrimination laws by requiring the EEOC to develop regulations directing employers to collect wage data, reported by the race, sex, and national origin of employees.

It will require the U.S. Department of Labor to reinstate activities that promote equal pay, such as: directing educational programs, providing technical assistance to employers, recognizing businesses that address the wage gap, collecting wage-related data, and conducting and promoting research about pay disparities between men and women.

More importantly for our young ladies going into the workforce it will establish a competitive grant program to develop salary negotiation training for women and girls.

As a Member of the Women's Caucus I have been fighting for pay equity for American women since before I arrived here as a Representative in 1995, and I believe that equal pay for equal work is a simple matter of justice.

Wage disparities are not simply a result of women's education levels or life choices.

In fact, the pay gap between college educated men and women appears first after college—even when women are working full-time in the same fields with the same major as men—and continues to widen during the first 10 years in the workforce.

Further, this persistent wage gap not only impacts the economic security of women and their families today, it also directly affects women's retirement security tomorrow.

Now is the time for additional proactive measures to effectively address wage discrimination and eliminate loopholes that have hindered the Equal Pay Act's effectiveness.

I urge my colleagues, both men and women to support equality in rights and pay for all Americans by supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act.

HONORING DR. TWANA COOKS-
ALLEN AT CONGRESSMAN
VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH
CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Twana Cooks-Allen of Harlingen, Texas for her exceptional service to the Rio Grande Valley.

Since earning her Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology and Marriage and Family Therapy, Dr. Cooks-Allen has been an esteemed professional in mental health for over 30 years.

Dr. Cooks-Allen's experience includes support to the Department of Homeland Security

and the Department of Defense, as well as local and state agencies in Minnesota, Missouri, Illinois, and Texas. Throughout her career, she has helped patients struggling with depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, chronic suicidality, substance abuse, sexual assault, pedophilia, eating disorders, schizophrenia, and personality disorders.

Dr. Cooks-Allen currently works as Marriage and Family Counselor at the Veterans Affairs Texas Valley Coastal Bend Healthcare System in Harlingen. She is also the proud founder of the Veteran Kids/Teen Program at the Veterans Outreach Center. The program provides children of veterans with emotional, psychological, and educational assistance.

A true champion, Dr. Cooks-Allen also spends her spare time helping our veterans and their children. Every year she hosts a one-week summer camp with activities, meals, and snacks for the children of veterans. Her goal is to create a place for these children to discuss their concerns and fears and to receive support from their peers, while enjoying activities. Not only does she dedicate her time to these programs, Dr. Cooks-Allen also funds many of the activities herself.

I am pleased to recognize Dr. Twana Cooks-Allen for her generous and invaluable support in Texas' 34th Congressional District. Whether working at the VA or volunteering with veterans, our district and the State of Texas are forever grateful for her work. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking her, her family, and friends on this special occasion.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF MARY
ALICE O'CONNOR

HON. MARK DESAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Mary Alice O'Connor, a longtime resident of the Bay Area.

Born in January 1943 to an Irish Catholic family, Mary Alice grew up in Chicago, Illinois. In 1968, she headed to the West Coast and eventually settled in the Bay Area. While raising three children, Mary Alice worked in her family's printing business and later for a telephone company.

Mary Alice was always passionate about philosophy and spiritualism. In 1991, she pursued her goal of bringing peace, joy, and compassion to the world by becoming an ordained Unity minister. She served the community through ceremonies for weddings, memorials, blessings, and other events. Mary Alice also taught inherent beauty and self-expression through spiritual rehabilitation sessions, working to promote physical and spiritual healing.

In the early 2000s, Mary Alice became the Executive Director of the Mt. Diablo Peace and Justice Center in Walnut Creek, CA. During her leadership, the peace center became an engaged and energetic community partner.

Mary Alice passed away on December 3, 2018. She is survived by her sister Margaret O'Connor; her children Glory Marshall, Sikwaya Condon, and Shasta Lockwood; and her grandchildren Chavez Li Condon, Moses Lockwood, and Jacob Lockwood; her former husband Pat Condon, and her partner Willard Davis.

Mary Alice O'Connor will be remembered by me and the Contra Costa community for dedication to peace and harmony in Contra Costa and around the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, on roll call vote 55, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "NAY."

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOCAL PROSECUTOR HOME RULE ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Local Prosecutor Home Rule Act of 2019 to give District of Columbia residents another important element of the self-government enjoyed by all other American citizens, including those in the U.S. territories. The bill would establish a local prosecutor's office designated under local law to prosecute all local crimes in the District. Under federal law, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, a federal entity, is responsible for prosecuting most local crimes committed by adults here, which is the greater part of its caseload, in addition to prosecuting federal crimes. This bill is special because it effectuates a 2002 advisory referendum, approved by 82 percent of D.C. voters, to create a local prosecutor's office.

There is no law enforcement issue of greater importance to D.C. residents on which they have less say than the prosecution of local crimes here. A U.S. Attorney has no business prosecuting the local crimes of a jurisdiction, an anachronism that is out of place in any American self-governing jurisdiction. In fact, the territories of the United States—Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands—all have local prosecutors to prosecute local crimes. The absence of a local D.C. prosecutor is one more anachronism from the pre-home rule days when D.C. had no local government. The goal of this bill is to give the District the same jurisdiction over the criminal justice matters that state, local and territorial jurisdictions justifiably regard as mandatory.

Amending federal law to create a local prosecutor would be an important step toward our goal of achieving true self-government. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

HONORING DONALD HAMM AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Donald Hamm for his positive contributions to the Rio Grande Valley.

Mr. Hamm was born in Montgomery, Alabama and joined the United States Army after graduating from high school. He was honorably discharged from the military after serving his country for six years. He enrolled in nursing school, and has served as a nurse in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) since the 1990s. The welcoming environment and diverse culture of the Valley encouraged Mr. Hamm to make Brownsville his permanent home.

Mr. Hamm is an active member of our community, engaging in areas beyond the medical field. He was elected 2nd Vice President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's LRGV chapter. Hamm founded the South Texas Mass Choir (STMC) in 2006, and serves as its director. STMC, the first and only Gospel Mass Choir in South Texas, had its debut performance in 2006 at the first ever Gospel Explosion in Brownsville, Texas at the Jacob Brown Auditorium. Mr. Hamm is also a pastor at the Kingdom Connection Worship Center, and provides marriage counseling to couples in the region.

I am pleased to recognize Mr. Hamm's positive work in Texas' 34th Congressional District. Brownsville is thankful for his service in the military and the medical field. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him, his family, and friends on this special occasion.

HOWARD G. LANE—JUSTICE,
JUDGE LAWYER, ADVOCATE

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, the Honorable Howard G. Lane, Supreme Court Justice, Queens County, 11th Judicial District (Retired) was elected Judge of the Civil Court in Queens County in November 2003, after 24 years of practicing law. A graduate of Manhattan College where he was awarded a Bachelor of Science degree and awarded a Juris Doctor degree in 1978 from Hofstra University Law School and the recipient of Fredrick Douglass National Moot Court Competition, "Best Oralist" Northeast Regional Competition Award and admitted to practice law in the state of New York in 1979.

From 1979 to Judge Lane's election to the Civil Court, he served as Law Clerk and Principal Court Attorney for Supreme Court Justice Leslie G. Leach in the Queens County Court prior to serving as a sole practitioner engaged in the private practice of law and hearings. In his long and distinguished career, he also served as a Hearing Officer for the Transit Adjudication Bureau and staff attorney for Community Action for Legal Services, Inc.

Justice Lane's approach to leadership is exemplified by his fervent belief in the concept of

teamwork and empowerment. His aim has been to lead by example, re-energizing and transforming the culture of the judicial institutions he has led through a partnership between administrators and front-line staff. His commitment to the Judicial System and his respect for the value of our law resulted in his legal opinions and rulings being recognized as exemplary of the finest legal analysis and thinking.

That I, GREGORY W. MEEKS, Member of the 116th Congress, on behalf of the constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of New York, congratulate Howard G. Lane for his twenty-four years of service to quality legal practice. On behalf of the 723,000 residents of the Fifth Congressional District, I thank Judge Lane for his outstanding and ongoing contribution to our Judicial Institution's integrity and local and global community's wellbeing.

COAL RIDGE CHEERLEADING CHAMPIONSHIP TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Coal Ridge Titans' co-ed cheer team for winning the 3A Cheer Spirit state championship in Denver. Their All-Girls team also placed second in the All-Girls category.

In total, the Titan's co-ed team scored 78.05 points over the opposing Strasburg, which scored 71.12 points. Bayfield placed third and Alamosa placed fourth in the state championship spirit competition. The Titan's success is a testament to their strength, teamwork, and dedication. Team members included: Kyla Boyd, Andrea Jurado, Pilar Pagni, Kalicia MacGregor, Haven Prodzinski, Cipriana Dacuma, Paige Stecklein, Christian Vasquez, Hartleigh Porter, Madison Balizan, Tana Couey, Tori Byers, Brayden Kammers, Nathan Tomasello, Nicole Elliott, Lacey Peterson, Annika Wight.

Alongside the co-ed team, the All-Girls Coal Ridge cheer team placed second overall in the state with an overall score of 68.02. Only four of the 19 girls on the team had formal cheer experience, which made their win especially significant. Their endless work-ethic and ability to overcome adversity, which culminated in their ultimate success, should make them proud. For many of the team's players, this win is the achievement of a goal they have worked towards for years. I commend their coaches and each member of the team for their sportsmanship and competitive spirit. Team members included: Olivia Oldham, Litzy Martinez, Litzy Rivera, Morgan Blodeay, Jinessa Hayden, Valerie Capraro, Samantha Sarmiento, Samantha Copeland, Leila Green, Natalie Smyth, Aurie Madrid, Savannah Madrid, Denisse Ortega, Odalys Quezada, Brynlee Elswick, Phoebe Young, Cara Groves, Rhaya Carmichael, Sydney Stanley.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have these incredible students call the Third Congressional District in Western Colorado home, and I offer my sincere congratulations. I wish them luck in their future endeavors, and I am eager to see what they will accomplish going forward.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN FIREFIGHTERS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 10th Anniversary of the African American Firefighters Historical Society. The African American Firefighters Historical Society was founded in Baltimore, Maryland on January 23, 2009 by two, now-retired, members of the Baltimore City Fire Department: Firefighter George Collins and Lieutenant Michael Jensen. It was started as part of an event celebrating the 55-year reunion of the first African Americans appointed to the Baltimore City Fire Department. While researching the history of African-American firefighters in Baltimore, it did not take long before they discovered that nearly every fire department around the country had its own story of African Americans contributing to their ranks.

The mission of the African American Firefighters Historical Society is to collect, preserve and disseminate historical data and information relating to the contributions made by firefighters of color, and others who have contributed to such history. This material is used to educate and mentor firefighters and the communities that they serve.

The Historical Society is also a 501(c)(3) charitable organization, and it hosts an annual Salute Dinner. This dinner honors African-American firefighters, entities, individuals, and dates that are significant to the fire service history of African Americans. It is the only event of its kind in the world, and they are proud that the dinner has become their signature event.

All the honorees over the last 10 years have been extremely deserving of their recognition. Most have never had their contributions acknowledged. These individuals are humble men and women, who would tell you that they were just doing what needed to be done. Whether it be to acknowledge a heroic act or some other significant act, such as being the first to reach a rank or position, accomplished by firefighters, the African American Firefighters Historical Society is always interested in finding these individuals. The organization also welcomes information about organizations who have reached historic milestones or anniversaries relevant to African-American firefighters.

To show just how relevant The African American Firefighters Historical Society has become, I would like to take a moment to share the stories of some of its honorees.

Stories of people like Edward Collic, who faced significant hurdles to becoming Baltimore City Fire Department's First African American Lieutenant Pilot. During promotion testing, Collic was given ten additional navigation questions by his Coast Guard examiner, effectively turning what is normally a 4-hour test into an 8-hour exam. Still, he passed and was reluctantly given his 100 Ton Masters Licenses. Collic worked as an Acting Lieutenant for thirteen years, being passed over for promotions several times despite consistently scoring first or second on the promotion exam.

In some cases, he was deliberately removed from the top of the list. Collic was finally promoted, possibly becoming Maryland's first African-American Fireboat Lieutenant. With a reputation for being the best Lieutenant Pilot, one night he was sought out by his Battalion Chief to respond to a train that had derailed with hazardous material on board. He took his fireboat up the Susquehanna River to Port Deposit, Maryland, on what would become the longest run in BCFD history.

The Society has also honored people like Mrs. Carrye Brown, on the 20th Anniversary of her appointment to the highest fire service position in the country. In January 1995, Brown was nominated by President Bill Clinton to be our Nation's first woman and first African American to head the U.S. Fire Administration. In that role, she was responsible for legislation, regulations and standards for all fire departments in the country. To this day, Mrs. Brown holds the record for the longest serving person in that position.

They also paid tribute to civil rights lawyers Kenneth L. Johnson and Gerald A. Smith. On December 6, 1971 they filed suit against the City of Baltimore to address discrimination in hiring and promotions within the city's fire department. This landmark decision changed the hiring and promotions processes in both the city's fire and police departments, benefiting countless individuals. Their 1973 victory cemented the legacy of their clients and rendered their firm a dominant force in civil rights litigation on the east coast.

The Society has also honored the Gorham Family. A tragic fire in August 1946 destroyed the home of Leroy and Lillian Gorham. Tragically, the couple lost three children: Jean, who was 5, Ruth who was 2, and Leroy Jr., who was only 11 months year old. In response, the community came together to establish Chapel Oaks Volunteer Fire Company in Prince George's County, Maryland. Without any knowledge or experience, men from all over the area started Maryland's only African-American Volunteer Fire Department. By the year's end, they purchased a fire engine and equipment and began providing fire protection for the Deanwood Park/Chapel Oaks Community. They have serviced Prince George's County ever since.

The African American Fire Fighters Historical Society has presented approximately 200 flags flown over the U.S. Capitol for honorees on significant dates of their accomplishments; obtained almost 1,000 Citations, Proclamations, Resolutions, Certificates of Recognition and Letters of Acknowledgment for honorees; successfully advocated for legislation to have a fire house named for an honoree; been instrumental in building partnerships, financing the design, and advocating for local government to establish The Racheal M. Wilson Memorial Park and Garden at the location of Racheal M. Wilson's death, the first woman killed in the history of the Baltimore City Fire Department, and sponsored Baltimore High School students' trips to Washington, D.C. for Capitol Hill tours and to visit my Braintrust panels at The Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Annual Legislative Conference.

As the African American Firefighters Historical Society reflects on their many accomplishments, they ask, "what's next?" George Collins, Founder and President states:

"We are looking forward to creating a brick and mortar entity in the form of a fire

fighter museum. This will showcase the unknown and often buried contributions of so many African Americans in the fire service. Yet we will always fulfill the purpose of our organization. Give people their flowers while they can smell them, show them acknowledgments of their accomplishments while they can see it, and tell them how much you appreciate them while they can hear it."

For these reasons, we stop to highlight the endeavors of The African American Firefighters Historical Society over the past 10 years.

HONORING BRIAN McDONALD AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Brian McDonald for his contributions to the Rio Grande Valley.

Mr. McDonald received a B.A. in Political Science and History from Texas A&M University, and a J.D. from the Thurgood Marshall School of Law at Texas Southern University. After law school, Mr. McDonald settled in the Rio Grande Valley, where he handled state prosecutions in the Cameron County District Attorney's Office.

Mr. McDonald's outstanding work and commitment to public service led him to his current position as an Assistant United States Attorney with the United States Attorney's Office in Brownsville. In this capacity, he dedicates his efforts to keeping the community safe through the prosecution of federal crimes. Our community is a better place thanks to his pursuit of justice for all people.

Mr. McDonald serves as a board member of the Cameron County Young Lawyers Association, where he works to connect young lawyers to the community through service programs.

I am pleased to recognize Mr. McDonald for his successful career thus far in Texas' 34th Congressional District. We are all thankful for his dedication to serving justice, and inspiring the next generation of lawyers in the Rio Grande Valley. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his potential and commending him in advance for his bright career.

INTRODUCTION OF PRIVATE STUDENT LOAN BANKRUPTCY FAIRNESS ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Private Student Loan Bankruptcy Fairness Act, a bill I introduced earlier today with my colleagues DANNY DAVIS and ERIC SWALWELL. This bill would provide critical relief to Americans in severe financial distress who are struggling with overwhelming private student loan debt.

Before 2005, private student loans issued by for-profit lenders were treated in bankruptcy like most other unsecured consumer debt,

such as credit card debt. Our bill will ensure that privately issued student loans will once again be treated like other consumer debt and be dischargeable in bankruptcy.

Private student loans have much in common with credit cards and subprime mortgages. For example, private student loans often have onerous interest rates with no caps and can include exorbitant fees and hidden charges. In addition, many lenders have used aggressive marketing and high-pressure sales tactics to target particularly vulnerable people, namely, young men and women without financial experience, and older Americans seeking to restart their careers by pursuing higher education and training.

To make matters worse, private student loans lack the critical consumer protections that come with federal student loans. For instance, private lenders are not required to—and typically do not—provide any of the deferments, income-based repayment plans, cancellation rights, or loan forgiveness programs that are available to federal student loan borrowers.

A hallmark of our nation's bankruptcy law is to give an honest but unfortunate debtor a chance to obtain meaningful relief. To that end, the law exempts very few types of debt from elimination through the bankruptcy process, and only for principled policy reasons, such as debts for child support, taxes, criminal fines and intentional injury.

In 2005, however, Congress changed the bankruptcy law without any substantive analysis so that student loans made by private, for-profit lenders became very difficult to discharge in bankruptcy.

Currently, the Bankruptcy Code prohibits the discharge of private educational debt unless the debtor, in addition to meeting the already stringent requirements for personal bankruptcy, proves that repayment would impose an, "undue hardship," on the debtor and the debtor's dependents. In practice, however, it's hard for a debtor to ever successfully meet this standard.

The current bankruptcy law unjustly punishes hardworking Americans who are simply trying to improve their lives by pursuing a higher education and became victims of predatory private student loan lenders.

We can do better.

I urge my colleagues to support the Private Student Loan Bankruptcy Fairness Act and restore the fair treatment of private student loan borrowers in bankruptcy.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FAIRNESS FOR BREASTFEEDING MOTHERS ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Fairness for Breastfeeding Mothers Act of 2019, a bill that would require buildings that are either federally owned or leased to provide designated private and hygienic lactation spaces for nursing mothers. For years, federal agencies such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have encouraged breastfeeding—the benefits are so great that

the Affordable Care Act amended federal law to require employers to provide a designated, non-bathroom space for returning employees to pump breastmilk for their newborns, ensuring that new mothers would be able to continue this essential practice even after returning to work. My bill would extend this requirement to include not just employees, but visitors and guests to federal facilities across the nation.

In Washington, D.C. alone, there are millions of tourists who visit federal sites, such as the Lincoln Memorial and the Smithsonian Institution. Increasingly, families understand the unique benefits of breastfeeding, and visitors to these buildings who have newborns and babies should have a private space to breastfeed or pump. The benefits of breastfeeding are well-documented—breastmilk contains antibodies and hormones that boost babies' immune systems, and studies have shown lower risks of asthma, diabetes, respiratory infections, and other diseases among breastfed babies. Moreover, breastfeeding also has benefits for nursing mothers, who, research has shown, have lower risks of diabetes and certain forms of cancer. Given the significant public health benefits of breastfeeding for both mother and baby, already recognized in federal policy, my bill is a logical next step to ensure visitors to federal sites have access to clean, hygienic, and private spaces to nurse or pump.

It is also important to ensure that lactation spaces are accessible to individuals with disabilities. While the Americans with Disabilities Act does not apply to federal buildings, the lactation spaces required by my bill would be subject to a similar law, the Architectural Barriers Act, which requires buildings and facilities that are designed, built or altered with federal dollars or leased by federal agencies to be accessible to individuals with disabilities whenever possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which would provide access to designated lactation rooms for guests to federally owned or leased buildings.

RECOGNITION OF NORFOLK FIRE-RESCUE CHIEF JEFFREY WISE'S 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Chief Jeffrey Wise's 40 years of service with Norfolk Fire-Rescue. His selfless work, bravery, and dedication have made the City of Norfolk a better place.

The health of our community depends on public servants. I want to thank Chief Wise for dedicating his life's work to the safety, health, and wellbeing of his neighbors.

Chief Wise has been an effective leader. He has spearheaded innovations in the quality and type of service Norfolk Fire-Rescue provides, and has devoted himself to the mission of "preventing harm in the community and maintaining the public's trust."

His dedication to the mission is inspiring, and I am confident that he has improved the lives and safety of many in the community.

I congratulate Chief Wise on his retirement. I commend him for his selfless work, and I

want to thank him for faithfully caring for the City of Norfolk for 40 years. I am confident he will continue to make an impact on the community.

RECOGNIZING WILLIAM J. "HAPPY" FULFORD III ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a pillar of the Southwest Alabama community, William J. "Happy" Fulford III, on his retirement as Executive Director for Government Relations at the University of South Alabama (USA). After more than 35 years of leadership, Happy leaves a legacy of devotion to his alma mater, as well as lasting and impactful relationships throughout Alabama and the nation. There is no way to measure the number of students, faculty, leaders, and members of our community that Happy impacted over his career.

Happy has been devoted to the success and advancement of USA since his days as a student. He graduated from USA in 1972 with a bachelor's degree, and he later earned a master's degree in Graduate Education Leadership in 1991.

Happy is also remembered for his service to our country, as he served in the United States Army Reserve from 1972 to 2002. During his time in the Army Reserve, he served in Operation Desert Storm and retired as a Colonel, having commanded at the company, battalion, and group levels.

During his service in the Army Reserve and shortly after his undergraduate education, Happy served as the president of the USA National Alumni Association, connecting members of the USA community throughout the nation through his inspired leadership style and outstanding personality. Happy continually forged new paths for USA, serving as the University's first Director of Alumni Affairs in 1981, its first Development Director in 1986, and its first Executive Director of Governmental Relations in 1998.

Happy's list of achievements, experience, and contributions will never be fully appreciated. Few people in this life give as much and ask as little recognition as Happy Fulford. A founding member of the Higher Education Partnership, a member of the Business Council of Alabama, American Legion, Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce, and many other organizations, it is clear that his outstanding service knows no bounds.

As his well-deserved nickname suggests, Happy is known for his easy-going, sincere, and positive outlook on life, while also remaining extraordinarily dedicated to the students, faculty, and staff at USA.

As he enters the next chapter of his life, I wish Happy, his wife Sherri, and his entire family all the best as they get to enjoy more time with each other. I know that in this new chapter, Happy will continue to serve the University of South Alabama in every way he can through his tireless efforts to make the students of Southwest Alabama prepared for tomorrow and making our community a brighter, better, and "happier" place to be.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the decades of service of William J. "Happy" Fulford. It is difficult to express our gratitude in mere words, but on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I thank him.

HONORING GEORGE McSHAN AT
CONGRESSMAN VELA'S BLACK
HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor George McShan for his exceptional service to Harlingen, Texas.

Mr. McShan received his Bachelor of Science from Prairie View A&M University, with cum laude honors, and his Master of Education from The University of Texas—Pan American. He also earned a Master School Board Trustee certification from the Texas Association of School Boards (TASB). He spent his early years as an educator in the Brownsville Independent School District, as a high school science teacher, and was also freshman class sponsor.

During an extraordinary 32 year career at Texas State Technical College, Mr. McShan served as Chairperson of Academic Instruction and Faculty, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Enrollment Management, and Dean of External Relations. In 1988, he was elected to the Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District Board of Trustees, and served as president of the board for eight terms. In 1998, he became TASB's first African American president.

Throughout his career, Mr. McShan has garnered awards and recognitions for his tireless efforts to improve the community, including the "School Board of the Year" award in 1993 and the "Abrazo" award from the National Hispanic Caucus of School Board Members in 2006. Additionally, the mayor of Harlingen named him the Chairman of the Harlingen Task Force on Juvenile Crime, Graffiti, and Gang Violence.

Mr. McShan started his own business in 2002, working as an independent consultant providing professional education services, and is a partner with BWP & Associates. He has led school board governance training for over thirty different school districts in Texas. He has also conducted over twenty-five superintendent searches across Texas as well as Arkansas, Alabama, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Ohio, Missouri and South Carolina.

I am pleased to recognize Mr. McShan for his successful career in Texas' 34th Congressional District. He is a role model for our children, and exemplifies the best our district has to offer. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his journey, his family and friends on this special occasion.

JULIETTE ALKINS HANSEN CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER, HEALTH ADVOCATE, EDUCATOR, CITIZENS, MOTHER

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, Juliette Alkins Hansen was born in Washington Heights, reared in Harlem, educated in the New York City public school and university system—Juliette Alkins Hansen is a New Yorker. Her Barbadian parents instilled in her an appreciation and pride in her heritage. Their participation in church activities (St. Ambrose in Harlem) gave her grounding in learning how to "give back" to your community/organization.

In their 47-year marriage, Richard and Juliette, individually and collectively, were involved in civic and community life. Juliette's non-political organizational activity included Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., the Girl Scouts of America, Jack and Jill of America, The Greater Queens Chapter of the Links, Juliette was the organizer for the Queens Chapter of the Links, York College Community Quilt, various scholars hip committees, and Magnet School Mentoring Program. Her board member participation included the American Lung Association; Jamaica Center for Arts and Learning, (JCAL). After several decades of JCAL board participation, Juliette retired. She was named the board's first Emeritus Board Member and remains active in many of the board's activities. This association gives her a continued ability to participate in the growth of this invaluable asset to our borough and city. She also served on the boards of Jamaica Service Program for Older Adults (JSPOA) and Jamaica NAACP. Being the Organizer of The Greater Queens Chapter of the Links brought her a sense of pride and accomplishment. Juliette feels blessed that God granted her the years to become a "Golden" 50-year Soror in her dear Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. She is an Emeritus member of the New York Chapter of the CARATS. Juliette and her family are members of Saint Albans Congregational Church.

Politically, her late husband, Richard led the way. During his tenure as President of the Jamaica branch of the NAACP in the early 1970's, the chapter continued its tradition of activism. As second vice president, Juliette was at his side when the chapter fought for Rochdale, the establishment of York College in our community, fair housing in Forest Hills and NAACP reform, et al. After his term ended, the couple became associated with the political campaigns of several local, city, state, and national aspirants. They worked with others in major fund raising activities for several candidates.

Through her various organizations, Juliette continued her connection with youth. She joined Dr. Gerald Deas in his campaign against "Quarter Water". These sweet colored water drinks have been cited as being asthma "triggers" for young Black and Latino children. As a board member of the American Lung Association and part of the Links Chapter, she addressed New York legislators in Albany regarding the need for regulatory legislation against such products. Unfortunately, these drinks are still on the shelves.

Now retired, Juliette had 23 years of varied experience in the field of education. As a charter faculty member of the Queens Bridge to Medicine program, she maintains an extended family of former students, who have kept her in their lives through graduate/medical schools, marriages and children. Juliette was honored with a nomination and placement to Who's Who Among American Teachers. Juliette's other honors include the Martin Luther King Scholarship—St. John's University; The Many Faces of Queens Women—Newsday; Community Service Award—Borough President Claire Schulman; Community Service Award—Borough President Helen Marshall; Community Service Award—Guy R. Brewer United Democratic Club, City Councilman Leroy Comrie's "Unsung Heroes" and the Queens Chapter of Jack & Jill honored her as one of their past chapter presidents.

"The greatest joy in my life has been my devoted late husband, Richard, our loving, statuesque daughters, Greer and Dionne and husbands, Manuel and Michael. My three munchkins (grandsons): Blake, Spencer, and Richard are my supreme joy! I feel honored to have received several awards from my community and to be blessed with many dear and true friends . . . thanks for giving me my roses while I can smell them."

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING
THE LIFE OF FIRE CHIEF TOM
SCHULTZ

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Fire Chief Tom Schultz, the thirteenth Fire Chief for the city of Garden Grove.

Fire Chief Tom Schultz began his career in firefighting at the age of 21 as a Fire Prevention Specialist with the Fullerton Fire Department. He soon became a firefighter, and later a captain. After 2 decades, he became the Training and Disaster Preparedness Officer, responsible for the department's overall professional Fire training and for updating and implementing the citywide disaster preparedness program.

In 2007, his diligence earned him the position of Shift Battalion Chief which allowed him to oversee the daily activities of the department. In 2011, while serving as the Deputy Chief of Operations, he was assigned to facilitate the management integration of the Fullerton and Brea Fire Departments. His extensive work ascended him to become the acting Fire Chief.

In 2015, after an established 30-year career, he was chosen to be the Fire Chief for the city of Garden Grove. Since then, he had proudly and wholeheartedly served the residents of Garden Grove.

Fire Chief Tom Schultz was known as the "firefighter's firefighter". For more than 25 years, he had been a Fire technology instructor at Santa Ana College, training hundreds of students with a passion for saving lives and serving the community.

Anyone who knew Fire Chief Tom Schultz can attest to his integrity, dedication, and humility. While he is a hero to many, he was also a loving son, husband, and father to his

family. Today, Fire Chief Schultz is survived by his wife of 27 years and children.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity to work with Fire Chief Tom Schultz; and I ask that the House join me in a brief moment of silence in honor of Fire Chief Tom Schultz's memory. We are forever in debt to his service. Shall his legacy live on.

RECOGNIZING COACH ERNIE
AYERS AND COACH JOSH POWERS

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Coach Ernie Ayers of Sand Creek and Coach Josh Powers of Madison, both of whom will be inducted into the Michigan Interscholastic Track Coaches Association Hall of Fame in February.

Coach Ayers has been leading Sand Creek to great success for the past 38 years. In that span, he has amassed 17 conference championships, 8 regional championships, two state titles, along with another 9 top-ten finishes. Adding to his accolades, Coach Ayers is already a member of one Michigan coaching hall of fame, receiving recognition for his coaching ability on the gridiron back in 2002.

When he took over the job at Madison, Coach Josh Powers recalled thinking, "Well, how does Ernie do it?" That formula has helped elevate Madison's track team to an elite program as well. While coaching 21 years for both boys and girls, Coach Powers has won a combined 22 conference championships, 11 regional championships, and three state titles.

Despite all these honors, both coaches display a sense of humility, strong character, and are role models for the high school students on their teams. The investment they've made over decades mentoring young men and women and demonstrating the value of teamwork and perseverance will leave a lasting legacy in our community.

Once again, I wish to congratulate Coach Ayers and Coach Powers on this impressive achievement and thank them for making such a positive impact on a generation of students in Lenawee County.

HONORING DR. DELORIA NANZE-
DAVIS AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S
BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELE-
BRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Deloria Nanze-Davis, a dedicated educator, for her outstanding leadership and mentorship in the Rio Grande Valley.

Dr. Nanze-Davis received her Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics and German from Texas Lutheran University. She earned both a Bachelor of Science in Accounting and a Master of

Education in Secondary and Higher Education from Texas A&M—Texarkana. Dr. Nanze-Davis capped off her academic career at the University of Houston, graduating with a Doctorate of Education in Supervision and Administration, with an emphasis in mathematics.

During her 43-year career as an educator, Dr. Nanze-Davis dedicated 34 of those years to the Rio Grande Valley community. She began as an instructor at the Texas State Technical College in Harlingen, Texas before teaching at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (UTRGV). While a professor at UTRGV, she was Chair of the Mathematics Department for 10 years, created the Math and Science Academy, and served as the Assistant to the Dean of Technology and General Education.

A leader and mentor inside and outside the classroom, Dr. Nanze-Davis has made an immeasurable impact on the lives and career of her students. While she was Chair of the Mathematics Department, UTRGV led the nation for several years in graduating more Hispanics with degrees in mathematics than any other university in the United States. She was also deeply involved in the development of Black History programs in the Valley to raise awareness in the community.

Since retiring in 2013 from UTRGV, Dr. Nanze-Davis continues to be a mentor and tutor for many students in the community. She proudly serves the Harlingen community by teaching mathematics at the Student Learning Center, participating on multiple city boards, and leading youth activities at Corinth Missionary Baptist Church as its Director.

I am pleased to recognize Dr. Nanze-Davis for her successful and important work in Texas' 34th Congressional District. We are all thankful for her courage and commitment to educating our children and young adults. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing her contributions to the community.

THE GATHERING PLACE

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise to shed light on an incredible new development in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

A Gathering Place for Tulsa, the nation's largest privately funded-park, opened in September after years of planning, construction, and anticipation. The park has quickly become a beloved and cherished landmark in Tulsa.

Recently, the Gathering Place won the USA Today's award for Best New Attraction in the country, a well-deserved honor.

While there were many amazing donors to this project, the Gathering Place could not have happened without the George Kaiser Family Foundation.

I'd also like to thank Tulsa Mayor G.T. Bynum and his predecessor Dewey Bartlett for their hard work helping this park become a centerpiece for our community.

The Gathering Place is drawing visitors not only from Oklahoma, but across our region and the country; it's a testament to the excel-

lence that is possible with strong public-private partnerships.

LIEUTENANT LEILA MORRISON
RECEIVING FRENCH LEGION OF
HONOR MEDAL

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and sacrifice of Lieutenant (Lt.) Leila Morrison, and to congratulate her for receiving the French Legion of Honor Medal from the French government. I believe that our nation's men and women in uniform are America's greatest assets. They have made incredible sacrifices and deserve our utmost support and respect for their service.

Lt. Morrison honorably served to protect America and her allies during World War II. During the war, she served as a combat nurse with the 118th Evacuation Hospital. Lt. Morrison worked in the pre-operation section of the hospital and helped support wounded soldiers. Furthermore, she cared for liberated prisoners at the Buchenwald concentration camp. The French Legion of Honor Medal is France's highest distinction for military and civil service. Lt. Morrison is well deserving of this award.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than the one we owe our veterans. They and their families should be commended. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes and deepest gratitude to Lieutenant Morrison.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Lieutenant Leila Morrison for her commitment to the United States of America.

IN HONOR OF THE NEW MEXICO
STATE REPRESENTATIVE HENRY
"KIKI" SAAVEDRA

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of New Mexico state Representative Henry "Kiki" Saavedra, who passed away earlier this week.

Kiki was a legend in the Roundhouse. A longtime friend and colleague of my father, I grew up playing with his young sons as our dads worked together. I remember his laughter, and later, as I grew up, I saw how that infectious spirit brought people together politically.

He was well liked and respected by everyone, regardless of party. And, whether it was infrastructure projects or funding issues, he got things done because of it.

Kiki was truly a special person, and I know his impact will be felt in the Legislature for decades to come.

My prayers are with Kiki and his loving family during this difficult time. May he rest in peace.

HONORING DR. EUGENE NUNNERY
AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S
BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Eugene Nunnery of Harlingen, Texas. Dr. Nunnery has been a practicing physician of Internal Medicine for the past 32 years, specializing in Rheumatology.

In 1971, Dr. Nunnery graduated from Purdue University with a Bachelor of Science in Chemistry and was an Honors Program Graduate. During his time at Purdue, he was a member of the Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi Honor Societies. Driven by his passion for chemistry, Dr. Nunnery later completed his Master of Science in Chemistry at the University of California, Berkeley, and earned his Doctor of Medicine at Washington University School, St. Louis. After finishing his Internal Medicine residency at the Metropolitan General Hospital in Cleveland, Ohio, Dr. Nunnery capped off his impressive academic career with a fellowship at the University of Texas Health Science Center in San Antonio, Texas.

Since opening his private practice in Harlingen, Texas, Internal Medicine Associates, Dr. Nunnery has demonstrated exceptional engagement with the community. He holds active staff privileges at Valley Baptist Medical Center and Harlingen Medical Center to treat patients. Dr. Nunnery is also active in the Cameron/Willacy County Medical Society, a Fellow of the American College of Rheumatology, and a member of both the Texas Medical Association and the Texas Medical Foundation. When not providing care for patients, Dr. Nunnery serves as a Clinical Research Professor at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley Medical School's Regional Academic Health Center.

I am pleased to recognize Dr. Nunnery for his significant work in Texas' 34th Congressional District. Our district is a much better and healthier place due to his service and expertise in medicine. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him, his family, and friends today.

SCHOOL BOARD RECOGNITION

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today as January is School Board Recognition Month.

I regret that this new job has prevented me from attending celebrations this month in the school districts across my district—Texas' 29th.

They include: Houston, Aldine, Humble, Sheldon, Channelview, Deer Park, Pasadena, and Galena Park ISD.

All these districts and their employees deserve a big Texas thank-you for all they do to prepare our children for their future.

Thank you especially to all of our School Board Trustees for all they do for our students

and schools in the Houston Region. We must all do our part to ensure our students get the well-rounded education they deserve.

Madam speaker, I also want to congratulate the Galena Park North Shore High School Mustangs Football Team in winning the Conference 6A D1 State Championship.

I urge everyone to attend a community pep rally this Saturday, February 2, 2019 at 3 p.m. at the Galena Park Stadium. Go Mustangs.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE LEGISLATION

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this week, I introduced three pieces of landmark campaign finance reform legislation. Out-of-control campaign spending has reached a dangerous level in this country and we must reform our campaign finance system if we are to restore voting power back to the American people.

First, I have introduced a Constitutional Amendment granting Congress and the States the power to establish limits on contributions and expenditures in elections for public office. This amendment nullifies Citizens United v. FEC. Additionally, the amendment concludes that First Amendment protections do not apply to the political speech of corporations and other business organizations with respect to the disbursement of funds in connection with public elections.

Second, I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the U.S. Supreme Court misinterpreted the First Amendment in the case of Buckley v. Valeo when it equated campaign spending with free speech. It is clear that Buckley v. Valeo failed to recognize that unlimited spending of money on elections has a corrosive effect on the electoral process. In order to secure free speech as a right of 'we the people,' this misinterpretation must be reversed.

Last, the Fairness in Political Advertising Act would require television broadcasting stations to make available 2 hours of free advertising broadcast time in each even-numbered year to each qualified political candidate in a statewide or national election. This would help level the playing field for viable candidates running against campaigns bankrolled by special interests.

My entire career in Congress, I have served in the People's House. We, the elected members of the House of Representatives, must stand with the people, not major corporations or wealthy donors who give millions to super PACs. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and return the power over our Democracy back to the American people.

CONGRATULATIONS HOWARD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW CONVOCAATION

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, through a Charter by the U.S. Congress, Howard Univer-

sity School of Law began as Howard University Law Department on January 6, 1867, during the Reconstruction Era, to provide legal education to students committed to the protection of the rights of African Americans. During this time, there was a great need to train lawyers who would have a strong commitment to help black Americans to secure and protect their rights and well as the rights of other marginalized communities. Howard Law also has significant ties to the Civil Rights Movement and other social movements that fought for civil rights throughout American history.

Howard Law was the first school in the nation to have a nondiscriminatory admission policy, admitting both black and white male and female law students.

Howard Law's mission is to:

Educate and enable students to develop their highest capabilities and skills as lawyers; Engage as an institution in the active pursuit of solutions to domestic and international legal, social, economic and political problems that are of particular concern to minority groups; and

Imbue its students with dedication to excellence and commitment to the solutions to those problems.

Famous alumni and faculty of the school include Dean Charles Hamilton Houston—"the Man Who Killed Jim Crow," Thurgood Marshall—argued Brown v. Board of Education and the first African-American Justice, multiple Congressmen, senators, district judges, governors, mayors, and the former Prime Minister of Jamaica.

We begin the celebration of the 150th Anniversary of its founding with a Sesquicentennial Convocation.

I, Gregory W. Meeks, Member of the 116th Congress, do hereby congratulate Howard University School of Law on its 150th Anniversary, on January 7, 2019.

HONORING MITTIE A. PULLAM AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mittie A. Pullam of Brownsville, Texas for her dedication to educating our children.

Mrs. Pullam earned her Bachelor of Arts in Literacy Arts from Samuel Houston College in Austin, Texas, and her Master of Education from Texas Southern University. After completing her master's degree, she moved to Brownsville, where she began her teaching career.

Mrs. Pullam dedicated her life to enriching the lives of African American children. She helped establish Frederick Douglass Elementary School, Brownsville's only segregated school, and was both a teacher and a principal there until the district was desegregated in the early 1960's, at which time the school was integrated into Skinner Elementary School. She worked at Skinner until her retirement in 1975.

As the first African American teacher and the first African American school principal in the Brownsville Independent School District (ISD), Mrs. Pullam led by example and instilled hope in the lives of the African American community. She worked to provide her

students with amenities that segregated schools often lacked, including musical instruments and electric fans. Brownsville ISD named her "Elementary School Teacher of the Year" in 1975.

Mittie A. Pullam Elementary School opened in 2009, honoring Mrs. Pullam's 28-year career providing our children with an equal opportunity. She attended the groundbreaking ceremony and was joined by the school's first class of students, the future leaders in our region.

I am pleased to recognize Mrs. Pullam for her outstanding career in Texas' 34th Congressional District, especially as an educator during a difficult time in our history. We are all thankful for her critical role in fighting for justice across the Rio Grande Valley. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mittie A. Pullam, her family, and friends for her success.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
ROBERT "SCAT" SCATTERDAY, JR.

HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to remember the life of Robert "Scat" Scatterday, Jr., of Wheeling, WV, a businessman, retired professor, a Vietnam veteran, a father and a friend.

Scatterday was known throughout our community for his leadership and service to others. For over 30 years I had the privilege of calling him my friend.

He retired from the U.S. Air Force as a major with 37 years of service, including 136 combat missions in the Vietnam War. His military decorations include the Bronze Star.

Scatterday spent 30 years teaching at Belmont Technical College in Belmont, Ohio, and treated every citizen of Wheeling, West Virginia, as part of his family.

Scatterday was active in the Wheeling community. He helped plan the Ogden Newspapers Half Marathon Classic and other events.

He served as a board member of the Ohio River Valley Council of the Boy Scouts of America; founded the Golden Gathering in Wheeling; supported the United Way of Upper Ohio Valley and Young Life in the Ohio Valley.

Scatterday inspired all those around him; he was a quiet, unassuming and humble man, a caring and thoughtful father and grandfather, and a wonderful friend.

He will be missed but remembered for everything he contributed to the Wheeling community and the positive difference he made in the lives of so many.

Scatterday is survived by his four children, his seven grandchildren and his large extended family.

May he rest in peace.

RECOGNITION OF NORFOLK'S
LONGEST SERVING POLICE OFFICER

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Captain Wallace Driskell Jr.'s 45 years of service with the Norfolk Police Department. His selfless work, bravery, and dedication have made the City of Norfolk a better place.

The health of our community depends on public servants. I want to thank Captain Driskell for dedicating his life's work to the safety, health, and wellbeing of his neighbors.

Captain Driskell has been an effective leader and worked his way up from patrol officer to captain.

His dedication to our city is inspiring, and I am confident that he has improved the lives and safety of many in the community.

I congratulate Captain Driskell on his retirement. I commend him for his selfless work, and I want to thank him for faithfully keeping the City of Norfolk safe for 45 years. I am confident he will continue to make an impact on the community.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND
LEGACY OF ANDREW J. MULDER

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Andrew J. Mulder and his decades of commendable service to the community in Holland, Michigan.

Two years after the start of his career in October of 1976 as the Deputy City Attorney for the City of Holland, Andrew extended his responsibilities in his capacity as an advisor to the Holland City Council. In 1987, after over a decade of proven service, Andrew was promoted to City Attorney. Andrew served in this capacity until deciding to focus the last five years of his career on legal work surrounding the new electricity generation plant of the Holland Board of Public Works.

Throughout his career, Andrew's heart for public service and the rule of law led him to serve on multiple boards for various legal organizations and associations. Andrew served on the Board of Directors of the Michigan Municipal Attorneys Association from 1995 to 2011, and was the President of the Association from 2007 to 2009. From 1995 to 2011, Andrew served on the Legal Defense Fund of the Michigan Municipal League, and from 2012 to 2019, Andrew served in the Academy of Municipal Attorneys.

Andrew's long list of accomplishments include the execution of legal portions of major projects like the Holland Area Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion, negotiating water contracts between the City of Holland and adjoining Townships, for the development of a new police department and courthouse in Holland, for the construction of a new Civic Center and associated farmer's market expansion, for the renovation of Holland's City Hall, the

implementation of Holland's renowned Snowmelt system, construction of the City Transportation Center, legal considerations for the State Boundary Commission Annexation and Detachment Project, legal work for the Kollen Park Improvement Project, and for Holland's Energy Park. Additionally, Andrew diligently litigated a number of cases on behalf of the City of Holland before Michigan's Supreme Court. These cases included *Meadowlands v. City of Holland*, *Adams Outdoor Advertising v. City of Holland*, *Fillmore Township v. City of Holland*, and *City of Holland v. Consumers Energy*.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Second Congressional District of Michigan, we thank Andrew J. Mulder for his more than 40 years of distinguished service to the residents of Holland, and to our great nation.

HONORING DR. CHARLES
RURANGIRWA AT CONGRESSMAN
VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH
CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Charles Rurangirwa for his leadership and contributions in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

Dr. Rurangirwa earned his pre-med and medical degrees at Montemorelos University in Mexico. After medical school, Dr. Rurangirwa completed a rigorous four-year residency program in Obstetrics and Gynecology (OB/GYN) at the King-Drew University of Medicine and Science under the Drew/UCLA Medical Education Program. His commitment and expertise have been recognized by his peers, faculty and staff. He has garnered many accolades throughout his career, including "Best Teaching Resident" award in OB/GYN by Ortho Pharmaceutical, "Most Outstanding Resident" award by the Drew-University of California—Los Angeles Class, and "Best Graduating Resident" by King-Drew Medical Center; and acted as Executive Chief Resident in OB/GYN from July 1996 to June 1997.

In 1997, Dr. Rurangirwa arrived in Brownsville and opened his private practice in OB/GYN, providing years of care for women in our community. Outside of the office, Dr. Rurangirwa volunteers at the Mary P. Lucio Health Center, a clinic in Brownsville dedicated to serving those who cannot afford health care. His contributions help the Rio Grande Valley, and serve as an example to our neighbors and the State of Texas in the health and care of women.

I am pleased to recognize Dr. Rurangirwa for his positive and compassionate work in Texas' 34th Congressional District. Brownsville is thankful for his unwavering service and dedication, setting an example for future doctors in the region. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him, his family, and friends on this special occasion.

VALERIE BRATHWAITE: JUSTICE,
MOTHER, WIFE, ADVOCATE

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2019

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, The Honorable Valerie Brathwaite Nelson, a justice of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, Second Department, which is the intermediate Appellate Court in New York State, was appointed in February 2016 by Governor Andrew M. Cuomo, making history as the first African-American female from the County of Queens to be elevated to Associate Justice of the Appellate Division.

Justice Brathwaite Nelson was educated in the New York City Public School System, is a graduate of Syracuse University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and received her Juris Doctor degree from the George Washington School of Law. Having married the greatest joy of her life Nicholas J. Nelson, adding to that union three children whom she considers her most important and greatest achievement.

Justice Brathwaite Nelson began her distinguished career as a Law Clerk with U.S. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, as well as serving in a variety of public and private legal capacities prior to establishing her private practice of law. Her approach to leadership is exemplified by her firm belief in the concept of teamwork and empowerment. Her focus has been to lead by example, while re-energizing and transforming the culture of the judicial institutions she has led. Credited with making tangible changes in the lives of women of color and their families both domestically and abroad through meaningful partnership, her commitment to the Judicial System and her respect for the value of our law resulted in her receiving numerous honors and recognition; Therefore, be it

That I, Gregory W. Meeks, Member of the 116th Congress, representing the Fifth Congressional District of New York, congratulate Valerie Brathwaite Nelson for her dedicated service to quality legal practice. On behalf of the 723,000 residents of the Fifth Congressional District, I thank Valerie Brathwaite Nelson for her outstanding and ongoing commitment to making positive contributions to our society's wellbeing.

STAFF SERGEANT PHILIP DAILY
RECEIVING FRENCH LEGION OF
HONOR MEDAL

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and sacrifice of Staff Sergeant (SSG) Philip Daily, and to congratulate him for receiving the French Legion of Honor Medal from the French government. I believe that our nation's men and women in uniform are America's greatest assets. They have made incredible sacrifices for our country and deserve our utmost support and respect for their service.

SSG Daily honorably served the United States and her allies during World War II. During his 25th mission as a B-17 tail gunner with the 772 Bomb Squadron, 463rd Bomb Group, 15th Air Force, SSG Daily's plane was shot down. He spent the remainder of the war at Stalag Luft IV Prisoner-of-War camp near Gross Tychow, Germany. SSG Daily's strength enabled him to survive the camp and endure the winter march of prisoners. The French Legion of Honor Medal is France's highest distinction for military and civil service. SSG Daily is well deserving for his assistance in liberating France from Nazi control.

Our nation owes no greater debt of gratitude than the one we owe our veterans. They and their families should be commended. On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my best wishes and deepest gratitude to SSG Daily.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to recognize SSG Philip Daily for his commitment to family, community, and the United States of America.

HONORING GARY WEST AT CONGRESSMAN VELA'S BLACK HISTORY MONTH CELEBRATION

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 2019

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Gary West of Brownsville, Texas, for his distinguished career as an educator for more than 40 years in the Rio Grande Valley.

As a teenager, Mr. West attended George Washington Carver Segregated School in Edinburg, Texas until 1955. After graduating from Edinburg High School in 1962, Mr. West attended New Mexico Highlands University, where he was a member of the college's baseball team. He later enlisted in the United States Air Force. Upon his return from the service, Mr. West attended Pan American College of Edinburg, Texas, where he earned bachelor's and master's degrees.

In 1970, he began his career as a history teacher in the Brownsville Independent School District (ISD) system, first at Cummings Jr. High School, and then at Rivera High School. An avid golfer, Mr. West was the golf coach for the high school teams, as well as part-time golf coach at Texas Southmost College, from 1970 through 2000.

He later joined the staff at Gutierrez Middle School in Harlingen where he taught history and coached the chess team. Mr. West dedicated himself to providing students with the best possible education until his retirement in 2014.

It is a tremendous honor to recognize Mr. West. Our district and country are very proud of his service, and his students and colleagues benefitted greatly from his commitment to educating and developing young leaders. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him for his work, honor, and accomplishments.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all

meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 31, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 5

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the outlook for energy and minerals markets in the 116th Congress.

SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine how primary care affects health care costs and outcomes.

SD-430

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine an implementation update on the Department of Veterans Affairs' electronic health record modernization.

SD-124

FEBRUARY 6

9:30 a.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine financial security in retirement, focusing on innovations and best practices to promote savings.

SD-562

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine worldwide threats.

SH-216

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 116th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine winning the race to 5G and the next era of technology innovation in the United States.

SD-G50

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee during the 116th Congress.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

To hold closed hearings to examine United States Army readiness.

SVC-217

FEBRUARY 7

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, and Donald W. Washington, of Texas, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service, both of the Department of Justice, Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, and Eric D. Miller, of Washington, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Paul B. Matey, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, and Chad A. Readler, of Ohio, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Allison Jones Rushing, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Rossie David Alston, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, Roy Kalman Altman, Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, and Rodney Smith, each to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Thomas P. Barber, and Wendy Williams Berger, both to be a United States District

Judge for the Middle District of Florida, J. Campbell Barker, and Michael J. Truncale, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Pamela A. Barker, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, Kenneth D. Bell, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, Jean-Paul Boulee, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Holly A. Brady, and Damon Ray Leichty, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, Andrew Lynn Brasher, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, Brian C. Buescher, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska, James David Cain, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Stephen R. Clark, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, Clifton L. Corker, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Daniel Desmond Domenico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Karin J. Immergut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, Matthew J. Kacsmayk, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Corey Landon Maze, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, David Steven Morales, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Sarah

Daggett Morrison, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, Carl J. Nichols, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Howard C. Nielson, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah, J. Nicholas Ranjan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, T. Kent Wetherell II, and Allen Cothrel Winsor, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, Joshua Wolson, and John Milton Younge, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Patrick R. Wyrick, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, M. Miller Baker, of Louisiana, and Timothy M. Reif, of the District of Columbia, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, and Richard A. Hertling, of Maryland, and Ryan T. Holte, of Ohio, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SH-216

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Africa Command and United States Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S755–S774

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 269–284, and S.J. Res. 7. **Page S769**

Measures Considered:

Strengthening America’s Security in the Middle East Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States–Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S756–63**

Pending:

McConnell Amendment No. 65, to express the sense of the Senate that the United States faces continuing threats from terrorist groups operating in Syria and Afghanistan and that the precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from either country could put at risk hard-won gains and United States national security. **Page S756**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, January 31, 2019; and that notwithstanding Rule XXII, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on McConnell Amendment No. 65 (listed above), at 3:30 p.m. **Page S773**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Mark Schultz, of Nebraska, to be Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education.

Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

10 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

52 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Pages S773–74

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S769–70

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S770–71

Additional Statements:

Pages S766–69

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S771–73

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon and adjourned at 3:16 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 31, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S773.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 75 public bills, H.R. 7, 860–933; and 13 resolutions, H.J. Res. 36–40; H. Con. Res. 10–11; and H. Res. 89–93, were introduced. **Pages H1331–36**

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H1339

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cárdenas to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1287**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H1287, H1317**

Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019: The House passed H.R. 790, to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, by a recorded vote of 259 yeas to 161 noes, Roll No. 64.

Pages H1295–H1306, H1313–17

Rejected the Brooks (IN) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 206 yeas to 216 nays, Roll No. 63.

Pages H1314–16

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–5 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

Page H1304

Agreed to:

Trone amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–5) that ensures all Secret Service employees are included;

Pages H1304–05

Fletcher amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–5) that includes certain NASA employees; and

Page H1305

Trahan amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–5) that clarifies the eligibility of any IRS employee for the pay increase (by a recorded vote of 243 yeas to 183 noes, Roll No. 62).

Pages H1305–06, H1313–14

H. Res. 87, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 790) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nays vote of 231 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 61, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 232 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 60.

Pages H1289–95

Suspensions: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Government shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur: H. Res. 79, amended, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Government shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 249 yeas to 163 nays, Roll No. 65.

Pages H1307–13, H1317

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, January 30th; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, February 4th; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, February 5th for Morning Hour debate.

Page H1318

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House

to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Representatives Conaway, Turner, Wenstrup, Stewart, Crawford, Stefanik, Hurd (TX), and Ratcliffe.

Page H1321

Clerk Designation: Read a letter from the Clerk wherein she designated Mr. Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts in case of her temporary absence or disability.

Page H1321

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yeas-and-nays votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1294, H1294–95, H1314, H1315–16, H1316, and H1317. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress, without amendment.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress, as amended; and approved subcommittee membership.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress and Staff Hiring Resolution.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. Committee adopted its Rules for the 116th Congress, as amended.

Joint Meetings

DHS FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.J. Res. 31, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to the call.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
JANUARY 31, 2019**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, January 31

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Thursday, January 31

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1, Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on McConnell Amendment No. 65, at 3:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12 noon.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Buck, Ken, Colo., E113, E116
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E111
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E110
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E112
Cummings, Elijah E., Md., E110
DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E108
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E109
Garamendi, John, Calif., E107

Garcia, Sylvia R., Tex., E114
Hern, Kevin, Okla., E113
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E115
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E108
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E114
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E107
Lujan, Ben Ray, N.M., E113
Luria, Elaine G., Va., E111, E115
McKinley, David B., W.Va., E115
Meeks, Gregory W., N.Y., E109, E112, E114, E116

Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E109, E111
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E107
Rouda, Harley, Calif., E107
Smucker, Lloyd, Pa., E108
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E109
Vela, Filemon, Tex., E107, E108, E109, E110, E112, E113, E114, E114, E115, E116
Walberg, Tim, Mich., E113



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.