The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER
Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain, United States Senate, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our way, our truth, and our life, we worship You. Quicken our consciences by Your holiness, that we will find nourishment in Your truth.

As this partial government shutdown continues, help our lawmakers to open their hearts to Your love and to surrender their desires to Your purposes.

Lord, in this tangled world, we are conscious of our woeful inadequacies to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice, and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human needs.

We need You, Eternal God, to crown the deliberations of this Chamber with Your wisdom to fit these challenging times.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam 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. 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 The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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. Will the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. DELBENE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
The SPEAKER. The Chair will enter-appoint to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

DO THE RIGHT THING AND REOPEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
(Mr. POCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues in Congress to do the right thing and support the Democrats' efforts to reopen our Federal Government.

We are seeing devastating impacts on 800,000 Federal employees who serve us, the contractors that work for us, and the economy that impacts every person in this country. Yet the President's petulant, adolescent approach to the shutdown has been supported by my colleagues through their inability to support reopening government.

Responsible governments around the world do not shut down, and leaders do not take hostages and demand ransom. Look, today the President is shutting down the government over an inefficient and unnecessary wall. If we capitulate, the next shutdown will be over his desire to lift sanctions on the Russians. The next shutdown could be over his desire to stop the Mueller investigation, and so on and so on.

This isn't how the United States can or should operate, yet the Republicans' complicity in this petulant behavior hurts our constituents and threatens our economy.

Mr. President, reopen the government before you further damage the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PIN-GREE). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING RIDGWAY AREA HIGH SCHOOL AS A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL
(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ridgway Area High School for being named a National Blue Ribbon School.

Since 1982, the U.S. Department of Education has identified and celebrated excellence in education through the Blue Ribbon Award.

Ridgway Area High School's tradition of academic excellence is a testament to this rural community's dedication to the importance of education. Like many small communities, the high school serves as a central hub in Ridgway. Faculty and staff work diligently to help each student reach their fullest potential.

Ridgway Area High School knows that families and community stakeholders are vital to the educational mission. They strongly value the idea that students who are involved in teams, groups, and community service

THE PRAYER
We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.
RECOGNIZING THE YOUNG PEOPLE OF THE DIOCESE OF SPRINGFIELD

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the young people from my home diocese in Springfield, Illinois, who traveled to Washington, D.C., for the 46th annual March for Life tomorrow.

Each year, nearly 200 students from throughout the Diocese of Springfield and the 13th District come to our Nation’s Capital to show their support for the rights of all people to choose life. It is truly inspiring to see so many—especially young people—marching for life, and I am proud to stand with them in their defense for the sanctity of human life.

Last year, I attended mass with these students to pray for all unborn children and for an end to abortion. Before mass, I learned that, when the students arrived in Washington, one of their classmates, Ayden O’Malley, from Nokomis, Illinois, suffered a serious medical episode. Ayden passed away 5 days later here in Washington. Although I never met her, I admire her convictions and willingness to be a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves.

This year, we remember Ayden as well as all unborn children whose lives were cut short.

SHUT DOWN THIS SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today, on day 27 of the Trump shutdown, to talk about the real-world impacts of the shutdown on the citizens of Springfield, Illinois, ordinary Americans who hope and pray for an end to this manufactured crisis.

This week, I held a tele-townhall to hear personal stories from my constituents. I heard from an 80-year-old grandmother who is worried sick about what a long-term shutdown means to her Medicare.

I heard from a TSA officer who struggles to make ends meet on his $23,000 salary and wonders how he will ever survive if he misses another paycheck.

I heard from folks who worry about their tax refunds and their SNAP benefits, their rental assistance and their home loans.

I heard from people who wonder how much longer will their children be able to get a warm meal when they get to school each day.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. It is time to stop the partisan games. Most of all, it is time for the Senate and the President to do their job and shut down this shutdown.

FIRE SAFETY CONCERNS AT WINTERGREEN RESORT

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to speak about a pressing local safety concern in my home community of Nelson. Wintergreen Resort is facing major fire safety issues.

Last week, I spoke with the local fire chief, who pointed out that having only one exit from the Wintergreen Resort creates the potential for a major public safety crisis. In the case of an emergency, such as a fire blocking the main exit, there would be no way to leave the resort.

I have called the National Park Service and asked that they help me mitigate this situation by allowing a secondary exit that will allow people to go from the resort, through the national park, and to the Blue Ridge Parkway in the case of a fire or emergency. This simple step, 450 feet, would safeguard the community against a potential disaster.

Government, when necessary, should be here to assist, not interfere. Guidelines that don’t make sense need to be changed so that common sense prevails.

GOOD PUBLIC POLICY DEPENDS ON ACCURATE DATA

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, good public policy depends on thorough and accurate data. For this week’s ruling by District Judge Jesse Furman to block the administration from adding a citizenship question to the 2020 Census is so important to my district on the central coast and to our country.

The 2020 Census is more than just about where people live. It dictates how our many, many boundaries are drawn.

The Census is enshrined in our Constitution, and it is a bedrock responsibility of our government. But adding a citizenship question to the Census with this administration in charge may scare people from actually answering the questions, and that could result in inaccuracies that jeopardize the disbursement of over $700 billion in funding for essential services in our communities like roads, schools, and even nutrition assistance programs.

This decision by the Federal judge is very much in the news, but we must continue to work to live up to our responsibilities under the American Constitution, and we can do that with a 2020 Census that depicts a precise population count through accurate data, adequate area counts, and appropriate questions that everybody in all communities can answer.

BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I would like to discuss border security not as viewed by Washington elites, but how it is viewed by average Americans.

Democratic leaders and the media will tell you that most Americans don’t support President Trump’s proposed southern border wall. They will tell you that a border wall is not needed; it is immoral; it won’t fix the country’s illegal immigration problem.

I currently represent Florida’s Third Congressional District, and here I have a picture of my district’s public recreation space, the 34th Street graffiti wall that is well known in Gainesville. This wall is used by local organizations to express their thoughts on issues and display information for community events.

Recently, local residents painted their support of President Trump’s proposed wall for all passersby to see. The wall reads: “Keep the government shutdown until the wall is funded. Call Congress. We the people demand Congress fund and build the wall now.”

It is a great example of everyday Americans voicing their support for what matters most to them.
It is clear that Americans do support President Trump’s security stance, despite exaggerated reports by the media. My colleagues and I will remain strong for border security and protecting this Nation.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise to implore the President to stop holding Federal workers hostage and immediately end this shutdown. I think every day of the TSA agents I recently spoke with at the airport. She is now working without pay, a young single mother raising her 15-year-old daughter. She told me she is really struggling to make ends meet without her paycheck. The majority of this is not unique. A constituent from Mundelein shared that she doesn’t know how she will pay her bills, including her mortgage, and has had to borrow money from her family.

Another constituent, a Federal employee in Round Lake, has been working without pay. He wrote: “Why are we a bargaining tool for something beyond our control?”

Why indeed, Mr. President? We may disagree on the best way to secure our border, but we can all agree that the good women and men working on our Nation’s behalf should be paid for their work—the TSA and FAA workers keeping our skies safe, the FDA workers keeping our food safe, and the Coast Guard protecting our borders.

Do the responsible thing: reopen our government, and then let’s have a robust, honest debate about how to secure our borders.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 28, FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 52 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 52

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled rank-member minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of January 25, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause (c) of rule XVI. 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. Is there an objection?

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the temporary Speaker pro tempore.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the purpose of debate only, I yield the bills, including her mortgage, and has had to borrow money from her family.

Providing for Consideration of H.J. Res. 28, Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019, and Providing for Consideration of Motions to Suspend the Rules
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When the government does eventually reopen, fortunately, many of these Federal employees will receive backpay, but the plight of Federal contractors is worse. The term “Federal contractors” can conjure up an image of highly paid executives or CEOs of private companies who rely on these contracts to make their rent or pay their employees or contribute to our local economies. The callousness with which these Federal contractors are being treated is repulsive. They and their families deserve so much better. The American people deserve so much better.

The longer the Senate Republicans keep our government shut down, the worse things will get. The Small Business Administration has already stopped approving loan assistance and guarantee applications from commercial banks and small businesses, programs that are critical to the health of local economies. Security lines at the airports are long, and they will get longer. TSA has already been forced to close security lanes at major airports across the country. This is not because the hardworking men and women of the TSA do not want us to keep our skies and our passengers safe, but because they have been forced to take second jobs to pay the rent or look after their children at home because they cannot afford childcare. Without a paycheck, some cannot afford gas or carfare to get to work at all.

Just a few days ago, I met with the air traffic controllers from my district. They shared that not only is the shutdown impacting their current workforce, but historically impacting their recruiting efforts to hire and train new employees for this workforce. Can we blame people for being fearful of taking a job that hinges on the Federal Government’s functionality, given what we have seen during this shutdown?

A National Air Traffic Controllers Association official warned recently that if the shutdown continues to drag on, there may not be any air traffic controllers left working.

Let us pause to make those statements abundantly clear. This shutdown is making us less safe. If it continues much longer, there will not be enough employees on duty to make sure passengers are safe to board a plane, not enough to keep our skies and our passengers safe.

If you think you are insulated from the effects of a government shutdown because you are not a Federal employee, you are wrong.

What I fear this administration and Republican leadership in the Senate have forgotten is that this is the people’s House. We have an obligation to work for them. Refusing to uphold that commitment, that promise, is a slap in the face to the American people.

Before I conclude, let me share with you one final story of how the shutdown is harming American families. Jessica from my district is a mother of six with a special needs child. Her husband is Active Duty Coast Guard. She has been forced to tell her children they can’t have seconds at dinner, because she doesn’t know if she will have enough food to last the week. Her daughter has an ultrasound coming up, and she is unsure if she can afford the specialist copay.

She writes that she and her husband supported President Trump, but that after this, she does not see “how we could support someone so out of touch and willing to damage so many people in order to save his own face.”

Jessica ended her message by saying that they are doing the best they can, but she is also prepared to stand at the corner of an intersection with a cardboard sign if that is what she has to do to feed her children.

This is not the America I was raised in. Let’s end the shutdown today and get our country back on track.

Mrs. LESKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I, too, have Federal workers in my district who are hurting, these great men and women who work hard each and every day of their life, single mothers who are waiting for their paycheck. So I call on my colleagues across the aisle to please come to the negotiating table.

I believe the number one rule in Negotiations 101 is you have to show up. Repeatedly, we have seen the Republicans and the President request the Democrat leadership to come and negotiate, give a counteroffer. They refuse to show up.

I say to the House Republicans already passed a bill that would have kept the government open and now we are at this impasse, but the Democrat leadership refuses to come to even a negotiating table or a counteroffer. I just don’t know what to say.

Well, Madam Speaker, once again, we have returned to the House floor to consider yet another short-term spending bill that once again is most likely going to be swept clean of disaster relief funding or funding for border security. Today, the fourth time in 3 weeks, we have returned to the House floor on a rule to consider an appropriations bill as part of the majority’s efforts to fund the government without working with President Trump.

Unfortunately, we think this effort is just as shortsighted as the previous bills over the last couple of weeks, and today’s rule is again destined to ignore the fundamental realities at issue.

But first, as I said before, let’s take a quick look at how we got to this point.

On December 20, the House of Representatives passed a bill that would have funded the government and prevented the shutdown. It included a continuing resolution through February 8. It included disaster relief and funding for border security that the Democrats say they want, but are not listening to our own law enforcement on the border or their recommendation was a bill the majority of the Senate supported and the President said he would sign.

Unfortunately, as we all know, the Senate refused to take up House measure, mostly because of their 60-vote rule, where they need Democrats to get on board, and parts of the government would shut down when appropriations lapsed. Again, not one single Democrat in the House voted for this bill, which would have avoided this whole, entire partial government shutdown.

On January 3, when the new Congress was sworn in, the House took up a continuing resolution through February 8, only this time swept clean of essential disaster relief funding or funding for border security. To date, the Senate, as we know, has refused to take up this measure, and the President has said he would not sign it because it doesn’t have additional money for border security.

Last week, then again, the House took up four more spending bills, that covered four of the outstanding seven appropriations titles. Unfortunately, like the week prior, these bills also did not include funding for border security. Even more unfortunately, these bills were ones that were produced by the Senate alone during the last Congress, and that did not even reflect any work by, or input from, the House of Representatives. Just as publicly stated the Senate has not taken up any of these bills during this Congress and has not even attempted to take them up either.

On Tuesday, this morning we took up yet another continuing resolution. This one a suspension bill, to fund the government through February 1, but, yet
again, omitting any funding for border security, which is the key ingredient to get negotiations done. That bill failed to reach the two-thirds threshold to pass under suspension of the rules.

And then, yes, yesterday, the House took up a supplemental disaster appropriation. And the House was intended only to provide just over $12 billion in necessary disaster relief for affected communities. This was a bipartisan bill. We could have passed it out of here. But instead of bringing up this bipartisan disaster relief bill to the floor, the majority chose to play politics once again and decided at the last minute to attach yet another continuing resolution to this bill, again, without any border security funding, and, again, to fund the government through February 8. That bill passed the House yesterday, yet there is no sign that the Senate ever has any intention of taking that bill up. In any event, the President has made it clear, and the American public has made it clear, that we want border security.

And that brings us to today. I have to tell you, I am running out of ways to describe what the majority is doing, but I want to be clear: the Speaker knows where I am going with this. Once again, the majority is bringing up yet another continuing resolution—this one goes to February 28—and, again, with no funding for border security. And yet again, it is clear that if we pass this bill, the Senate will not consider it and the President will not sign it because it does not include funding for border security.

We now see the common thread in all the majority is doing: bringing up bills again and again and again, to fund the government, without dealing with the fundamental problem. All of these repeated continuing resolutions are the same. Only the date has changed. All of them fail to fund border security, which Americans have told us again and again they want and need. And all of them are continued avoidance of what needs to happen in order to end this shutdown: real, sincere negotiations with the Senate and the President over border security.

I feel that this is an exercise in futility. The majority is failing to acknowledge the crisis happening at our southern border. As you know, I am a Member from border State who again and again have told the Democrats get serious about ending this government shutdown and come to the negotiating table to work out a deal that has a real chance of being signed into law?

Listen, I know that border security is a crisis. The other night on TV, when Speaker PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER said it is a manufactured crisis, I can tell you firsthand, that is not accurate. We do have a crisis on the border, and we need to fix it. I have been to the border several times. I recently visited the United States-Mexico border in Nogales, Arizona, where I met with Customs and Border Protection agents. The crisis we are dealing with at the border is not just illegal immigration, they said. There is illicit drugs flowing through our borders, which are killing our children and adults, human trafficking, and they told us that dangerous and cartels are using loose immigration laws to exploit the women and children, having them travel thousands of miles.

Do you know that Doctors Without Borders say that, I believe one in three women, these women have been sexually abused? This is unconscionable. We need border security. And it is the law enforcement, the Customs and Border Protection, that have said repeatedly, have told me personally, yes; part of the solution is a border fence.

In 2006, Democrats supported a border fence. CHUCK SCHUMER and then-Senators Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton funded $32 billion for 700 miles of fencing. Now the President is asking for $5 billion for 200 miles of fencing. This is not for the 1 percent of the Federal budget. And, unfortunately, because of their refusal to add this to any bills, it has shut down the government.

This rule before us today is just another ploy. Democrat are refusing to negotiate and refusing to deal with this national security issue. Please, let’s stop these games and pass a real bill that funds border security, that opens the government, that funds disaster relief, send it to the Senate, and have it signed into law.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I understand the frustration of the gentlewoman from Arizona with the lack of progress in ending this shutdown, but I would suggest that her frustration is misdirected.

The House has sent seven bills to end the shutdown to the Senate, and the Senate leadership has refused to entertain any of them or bring them to a vote: #whereismitch.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, this shutdown has been brutal on working people across the country. Many of them are my constituents, and I came down here to let their voices be heard.

Back home, a Border Patrol agent from my district said about all of us here in the House, in the White House, in the Senate: “I blame all of you for the financial and emotional damage you are causing to the very people tasked with protecting your Nation and yours to the border security funding: over $1 billion in new funding for new border security. The Republicans say that they want to reopen government and secure our borders, I also know that my party has said the same, so let’s do it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the CR today, let’s reopen government, let’s put people back to work, let them work. They are public servants. They want to serve the people. Let’s start securing our border. And with those extra billion dollars we can also move on to a more robust debate about border security that I look forward to.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my good friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time to speak on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this rule. I think we are talking past each other, as the previous gentleman from Maine just indicated. We want the government to reopen, but we want something called border security. I am told that this bill has $1 billion in it for border security, but we are not going to build a wall.

Down here is the thing that happens. Down in Arizona, where we live—we don’t live 2,000 miles away from that southern border where the immigration problem is that the illegal border crossings are monumental—we actually see the humanitarian crisis. That crisis exists when people, who are coming to America, they don’t go through the ports of entry, they are going between the ports of entry, in some of the most rugged land and terrain in the world, coming down from the Sierra Madre mountains in Mexico in the summer time, blazing heat of 120 degrees or more; in the winter time, the evenings cool down to 20s.
I saw people, just yesterday, being shown on the news, who are getting ready to try to make this trek. They are carrying plastic grocery bags with their supplies. They are dressed casually. They have no comprehension of the danger; they are bringing to themselves, where they are coming across. It is a humanitarian crisis. Do you know what a border wall would do? It would provide a deterrent.

In the San-Diego-San Ysidro port of entry where the border wall was created, crossings declined almost 90 percent. It forced people to a different place. They began crossing away from the ports of entry at San Diego over to Arizona and Texas. So we built a wall around the Yuma port of entry. Do you know what happened? Those crossings decreased 75 to 80 percent. They moved on to more dangerous places in the desert, down towards Nogales, between Nogales and South Bisbee, between Naco and the Douglas port of entry. More than 100 individual’s bodies were found last year trying to enter. It is a humanitarian crisis.

The opioids that come across the southern border: 141 tons of heroin seized coming across the southern border last year; 140 tons of cocaine seized coming across the southern border. When I hear people say border security, they start talking about drones and unmanned aerial vehicles and sensors and cameras. Guess what? That does not deter anyone. We get to watch the videos of people crossing. But do you know what a wall does? It channelizes people. It forces them to go to places where we can intercept them. We provide hundreds of millions of dollars of humanitarian aid to people who are risking their lives trying to enter this country.

If it wasn’t so serious, I would find it laughable. Folks say, “We are putting $1 billion into this as border security,” because they don’t want a political victory for President Trump. It is not about political victories. It is about national security, it is about humanitarian concern, and you are not going to get a better bang for your buck than to build a border wall.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, my good friend.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, folks in the audience, and folks that are watching this on TV, this is all theater. This is all just political theater.

Everybody knows, I know. My good friends on the other side of the aisle know that this isn’t going to solve anything. This is not a solution. If we were serious about solving this, we wouldn’t be voting on another bill here that doesn’t fix anything, that is never going to be moved through the Senate, that is never going to be signed by the President.

If we were interested in opening the Federal Government, we would be negotiating. We would be talking about what our differences are about border security.

Remember, this is a bill that includes the funding for border security. That is why we have this partial shutdown, because there has been a disagreement about border security. And we are trying to work it out, but we can’t work it out just by running the same bills that don’t do anything and that are never going to move through the Senate and aren’t going to be signed by the President.

It is time to get serious.

Last year, this government was shut down for a few days over amnesty. Now it is shut down because the other side doesn’t want to talk about border security. You put amnesty and the lack of border security together, and that is open borders. That is completely open borders.

Just on the news, if you were watching the last couple days, more caravans heading south; We are seeing Central America through Mexico to the United States border. That is what is happening right now while our Border Patrol agents are out there working but not being paid.

Here come these folks. We don’t know what their circumstances are. I am sure there are a lot of fine people in there. I am sure there are children in there, and the horrors that they are going to suffer on this trek north up through the desert in these points between the border.

Madam Speaker, the most recent numbers out of Homeland Security in November, 51,000 people—that is the ones we caught—51,000 people came across the border between the points of entry.

If they were coming to the ports of entry, this wouldn’t be half of a problem, but the problem is they are coming between the ports of entry. That is one month, 51,000. And those are the ones we are hearing about. I have no idea how many others made it through.

And yet some folks are saying: Well, we are going to give you an extra billion dollars to fix this problem.

It is not an extra billion. It is the same billion, and it is to fix problems at the ports of entry.

Madam Speaker, the problem is between the ports of entry and the ports of entry. But we are not going to do anything about the ports of entry. The $1 billion dollars we are talking about is to muddle around and maintain things at the ports of entry but do nothing between the ports of entry, nothing at all. That is the status quo.

That is why we are in this argument, because we are saying we cannot withstand, we cannot maintain the status quo of 51,000 people a month coming illegally across our border and do nothing.

We are pleading with the other side: Please, let’s have something. Let’s do something different than the status quo, because the status quo gives us 51,000 people coming illegally across the border.

And they are saying: Well, we are just going to run the same bill to open the government and do nothing.

We cannot abide that. The American people cannot abide that.

People are working, Madam Speaker, who are being paid, or they are being paid in part, but they are working. We are all here working, right? We are all here working. We are not doing anything to solve the problem.

What it is going to take is somebody to sit down at the table and say, Look. See here. This is what I think the issue is, and find some solution somewhere in the middle. But you can’t do that if you are not willing to have a discussion.

We are asking to have a discussion so we can get past this, so people can get paid, and the American people can be assured that their government is securing their border, their property, their country, and stopping all these illegal immigrants from coming in; and making sure that, if they are going to come in—and we are a country of immigrants.

My grandmother, my great-grandmother came here from Colombia, South America, with the shirts on their backs. They came through Ellis Island, because we had a process. We are a country of immigrants, and we welcome immigrants more than any other country on the planet, but we want you to come legally.

We have a process. We don’t want you to just pour across the border into our country with gang-related violence, with fentanyl, with opioids that are killing people in our own communities, all these drugs and crimes and violence. We are asking you to come to the ports of entry and quit pouring in because the ports of entry. But our laws now invite them to do that, which is why they are coming.

So I just beseech you, Madam Speaker—and I thank you for your indulgence and for your time—let’s quit this show. Let’s quit this charade. Let’s quit this theater. Let’s get serious for the people who are working, for the American people who expect more, and get down to negotiation, come to a solution, and move on with things, the important things that plague our Nation.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I am surprised to hear my colleague talk about political theater. We have a reality-show President in the White House who is ignoring the real lives impacted by the shutdown, all to try to make another made-for-TV moment to please his rightwing base and radio pundits. Government isn’t a game. Real lives are at stake, and we need to reopen the government.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the gentlewoman has any remaining speakers. If not, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close as well, and I yield myself to the Chair.

Madam Speaker, in closing, this is the fourth time we have deliberated on this floor, in the last 3 weeks, on the exact same type of package.

The date keeps changing—sometimes it is February 1; sometimes it is February 8; sometimes it is February 28—but it is all the same. None of them include funding for border security. It is the fourth time that the same result will ensue. The House of Representatives is in a perpetual cycle of Groundhog Day that we cannot seem to escape.

Representative SCANLON and I serve, of course, on the Rules Committee together, and it is Groundhog Day. We just say the same things each and every day. Really, let’s get to the negotiating table, and, really, let’s get something done.

The majority seems to be insistent on reviewing these same appropriations packages again and again, fully knowing the Senate has made clear they will not take up these bills because there is no border security in them.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention that this bill is again coming to the floor under a closed rule. Of the eight bills the bill is again coming to the floor under remiss if I did not mention that this cause there is no border security in them, they will not take up these bills being that the Senate has made clear packages again and again, fully knowing the House of Representatives is in a perpetual cycle of Groundhog Day. We are serious about getting Federal employees and businesses are feeling from the shutdown and get to work on making this country a better place for all.

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

Let’s end the pain American families and businesses are feeling from the shutdown and get to work on making this country a better place for all.

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

The-speaker pro tempore. The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH, Vermont, to rank after Mr. WINTERSTEIN, New York.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 52; and The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 150.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 28, FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 52) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, 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 resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—230

Adams, breaking

Aguilar

Alfred

Anne

Barragan

Clyburn

Beatty

Bera

Beyer

Bishop (GA)

Bлиненсер

Boustead

Boehlert

Broun

Brown (GA)

Brown (MD)

Brown (OH)

Brownsley (CA)

Bustos

Butterfield

Carbajal

Cardenas

Carson (IN)

Cartwright

Casten (IL)

Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy

Cicilline

Cisneros

Clack (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cohen

Connolly

Cooper

Correa

Costello

Courtney

Cox (CA)

Craig

Crist

Cresap

Cuellar

Cummings

Cunningham

Davis (KS)

Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny K.

Dean

Gonzales (TX)

DeFazio

Dedina

DeLauro

DeH慈悲

Delgado

Demings

DeSaulnier

Deutsch

Dingell

Doggett

Doyle, Michael

Engel

Eskelsen

Armstrong

Evans

Finsterauer

Fletcher

Foster

Frankel

Fudge

Gabbard

Galllego

Garamendi

Garcia (IL)

Garcia (TX)

Golden

Green (TX)

Grijalva

Hanna

Hartzler

Harper (CA)

Hastings

Hayes

Hastings
FRANCISCO AND AGREEMENTS TRANS-
There was no objection. Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Today is the 27th day of the Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in American history. Hardworking public servants are seeing their financial security jeopardized. Small businesses are being frozen out of critical contracting and loan programs. Businesses of all sizes are being hurt by delayed regulatory approvals and a lack of government data. Farmers are unable to access vital Federal services. Our national parks are being vandalized and filling up with garbage. Critical environmental inspections to protect families and communities have stopped. Lines at airports are swelling, as many TSA workers can’t afford to work without pay.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. But, unfortunately, we heard yesterday in this very House that Republicans think reopening the government is a poison pill. Frankly, that, my friends, is unbelievable. We can and we must do better, which is why House Democrats are bringing up our ninth piece of legislation to reopen the government and end the Trump shutdown.

The continuing resolution would provide an additional option for President Trump and Senate Republicans to take “yes” for an answer and end the shutdown. It would open the government through February 28, providing time for Congress to come to a full-year agreement without further jeopardizing vital services or the pay of Federal employees.

The order of business, Mr. Speaker, should be simple: Reopen the government, pay Federal employees, and then negotiate on border security and immigration policy.

It is long past time for my colleagues across the aisle and across the Capitol to come to their senses and end this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to put it simply, that is not a bipartisan consensus. I hope Members on the other side of the aisle will come back to the negotiating table and work with Republicans in the House, the Senate, and the White House to find a compromise that will address the crisis on the border and reopen the government.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my excellent colleague from California (Ms. LEE), an outstanding senior member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank the gentlewoman for her tremendous leadership on so many issues.

I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 28, this continuing resolution bill to reopen the government through February 28. This legislation would end the Trump shutdown and ensure that our Federal employees get their paychecks, like, now.

This bill also sends a clear message that we will not let President Trump hold this government hostage for his irresponsible, mean-spirited wall.

Mr. Speaker, this is the longest government shutdown in history. The government has been closed now for 27 days—27 days, mind you. All the President has to do is say: Yes, I will open up the government.

Meanwhile, we Democrats continue to do our job and demand that the President do his. We have passed seven pieces of legislation to end the Trump shutdown—seven. But we can’t reopen this government alone. Senator MCCONNELL should do his job to end this crisis.

Now, let me be clear: By continuing this reckless shutdown, President Trump is leaving 800,000 Federal workers and 200,000 low-wage Federal contractors in the lurch. Not only is this an insult to their hard work, but it is a slap in the face for the families who have no other way to pay their bills.

I have spoken to many people in my district who can’t afford to buy gas to
Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to speak in opposition yet again to this Democrat offer for a continuing resolution. As has been said, this resolution today goes through February 28, and I am not sure why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle expect a different outcome just by changing the date.

There is, however, one simple way to get a different outcome, and that is to come to the table and negotiate and talk. Show up at the table when you are invited to negotiate. There is a seat there waiting.

The people elected the President, and they elected each of us, and they elected us to do our job. Quite honestly, legislating is a very serious job, not putting veto-bait bills on the floor of the House to be voted on over and over again, knowing what the outcome is going to be.

All of the political points, I think, have been made over and over again as we have debated these continuing resolutions. I think it is important that we put partisanship aside. We have to work together. We all have to sit down at the table and decide how we can move forward.

Just saying “no” to a physical infrastructure, in my opinion, is not a negotiating position.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this bill that is going nowhere so that we can get back to the serious business of the legislative process. Let’s show the American people that we deserve the trust they have placed in us to govern.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ADERHOLT from Alabama has just said this is “veto bait.” What is veto bait? A proposition to open up the people’s government. Veto bait?

What is the Republican position? Unless the coequal branch of government, the House of Representatives, says “yes” to the President of the United States, you will continue to support, ad infinitum, closing down the American Government.

Our Russo security—we won’t call them enemies, but adversaries, at least, are very happy, I am sure, that the American Government is shut down.

Our Russian competitors are very happy that the American Government is shut down. We look ridiculous on the national and international scene.

I ask one of my Republican colleagues to stand, and I will yield to them. Tell me, who wants the world to shut down?

You are correct. The answer is, I can’t find any government in the free world that shuts themselves down.

Is that what you won’t vote for, opening up the government, the people’s government? Is that what this fight is about?

Or is this fight about, Mr. President, you tell us what to do?

Mr. MCCONNELL says he won’t put anything on the Senate floor that the President won’t sign. My, my, my, what a coequal branch of government we are.

Article I says we make the policy. We decide what is rational to spend $5.7 billion on. Experts tell us this wall won’t work. Senator CORNYN, Senator GRAHAM, Senator KENNEDY, other Senators have said this is not a good investment.

By the way, somebody else who said that was Mick Mulvaney, some years ago; he is now Chief of Staff at the White House.

This is not a partisan issue, and this is not about the wall, nor was it about the ACA, nor was it about the level of education funding when Gingrich shut down the government or when Ted Cruz and the Freedom Caucus shut down the government.

Thank God for John Boehner, who had the courage to say shutting down the government does not make any sense. It is a stupid policy. Thank God for John Boehner, who came to the floor, notwithstanding the fact only 87 of his Republican colleagues would support it, but with all the support of the Democrats, we opened up the government after 26 days.

Now, we have exceeded it this time. What happens 2 weeks from now when the President says: Either you do it my way or no way, or I am going to shut down the government.

We are paying a high price, Mr. Speaker, for shutting down this government, not only the 800,000 hostages who have been taken by the President of the United States, with the complicity of his Republican supporters in the House and in the Senate. 800,000 people, 400,000 of them forced to work without getting paid, 300,000 of them sitting home and saying: How am I going to pay my mortgage? How am I going to pay my car payment?

They don’t know. I talked to a veteran just 3 days ago who represents a lot of veteran organizations. He said to me: Do you know the highest reason for veteran suicide?

I said: No, what is that?

Fiscal uncertainty.

We have a lot of veterans in the Federal Government. We have a lot of veterans who are either laid off or working and not getting paid. We are creating financial instability and anxiety among our employees. What a stupid way to run a business.

Yesterday, we had a motion to recommit, and it was to strike opening the government of the United States. That was apparently, as the chairwoman has expressed, a poison pill for my Republican colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t get it. We were sent here by our people to make their government run efficiently and effectively for them and for our country, and what have we done? We have said: If the President won’t agree to opening up the government, we won’t either.

Yes, we have tried every kind of alternative: opening it up for 7 days, opening it up for 14 days where we can negotiate, and now we are saying to open it up for a month, put people back to work, give them a paycheck.

Or is this fight about, Mr. President, the President’s Council of Economic Advisers say just the other day? We are hurting the economy of the United States, which hurts everybody and the international community.

I don’t get it. I can’t think that the American people will get it, that their Congress sits supine and says we will only pass something if the President says it is okay.

Have we come to this state where the Article I branch of government, given the power by the people to make policy, says to the person in the Second Article, given the responsibility of executing policy, to tell us: You guys who make policy, don’t do it unless I tell you you can?

How sad, how lacking in respect for our own responsibility and duties to sit idly by while not only 800,000 people are held hostage, but also millions and millions and millions of others who are sent daily by those 800,000 people.

I plead with my colleagues: Stand up. Reject this policy of shutting down government whoever does it, whichever side does it.

And we don’t do it. We don’t believe in it. Mitch MCCONNELL doesn’t believe in it. He said just a few years ago it was a failed policy. And he, Senator MCCONNELL, was the guy that opened up government. That is what he said. He has now abandoned that, unfortunately, to the detriment of our country—not just to the detriment of our Federal employees, to the detriment of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope every American would call their Member and say: Look, you guys have differences. That is all right. But don’t shut down my government; don’t hurt my economy; don’t hurt my neighbor; don’t hurt my mom and dad; don’t hurt my child; don’t send people to the border to make us secure when you talk about border security. Then don’t pay them and have them worrying about when they are going to get their next paycheck.
We are better than this. The Congress ought to be better than this.

In a bipartisan way, we ought to say to the President of the United States: We are for you, against you on this, that, or the other policy, but we are united in the thing that we do not want to shut down the people’s government. Pass this bill. Send it to the Senate. Let’s open this government. It is the right thing to do.

Ms. GRANGER, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 28.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member GRANGER for allowing me to speak and acknowledge my friend and colleague, the full chairwoman, Mrs. LOWEY, on the other side of the aisle.

I feel compelled, though, at this point in time to respond to the rhetoric from the majority leader. The majority leader, the gentleman and my friend from Maryland, is very articulate and he pleads his case, but as he is pleading his case, the cure is right in front of us.

I am not going to banter around this Chamber with terms such as “good faith” and “bad faith.” Mr. Speaker, we must come together and open it. But I would argue that the governmental shutdown is good, but to be honest, 76 percent of the government is open.

Perhaps in other times when we have had government shutdowns and more of the government was closed, it gave us more of a catalyst, more of an impetus to come together and open it. But the fact is that 26 percent of the government is closed. The fact is that over 800,000 men and women and Members of this Chamber on both sides of the aisle—so that the American people know the truth—many of whom, like myself, have suspended our pay.

But I would argue that the gentleman from Maryland is wrong in one big basic area: We know that the cure that they are offering on the other side will not work. It is analogous to going to a doctor; it is analogous to basically saying, “I have got a problem,” and the doctor says, “This won’t cure you. This won’t cure you.” They are coming back on the other side of the aisle, perhaps with passion, perhaps in good faith, but they are wrong.

What I am asking for is both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, as an appropriator—and there are appropriators sitting right over there, right over here. We are the committee that solves problems. I am a believer that the problem will not be solved with the cure or the solution that is offered, you come back to the table and you come up with something that will work.

The President of the United States is willing. All 535 Members of the United States wants to see the government open, as do most American people, but the President of the United States and I want to make sure that our borders are safe and secure.

Opioid addiction, drugs are pouring across our border. People are being abused. Children are being abused. We have got to stop this not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans.

We have got to come to the table with a “critical infrastructure,” a “critical infrastructure,” and yes, a compromise, something that will work, that the House, the Senate, and the White House, two of our three respective branches of government, will support and get this government open.

So I feel the pain of a partial government shutdown. It is wrong. The gentleman from Maryland is correct in that assertion. But I also know this: to offer a cure that will not work is wrong as well.

The cure is to come to the table. The cure is to negotiate in good faith with something that will work.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we can get this government open; we can secure this border; and we all, as American Representatives, can serve the American people and keep our great American Republic safe.

The poisonous rhetoric has got to stop; the partisan bickering has got to stop; and this great committee and this great House will get to work and start working on other issues to fund the government.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are opening the government. Democrats have voted every day for the last 2 weeks to 3 weeks on opening the government.

I ask a simple question: To those who are out working today, what would they think of working a full day’s work with no pay?

My good friend and colleague wants to put this in percentages, just a small amount of folks who are out and are being devastated. But if you ask any American as they get up and go to work and they work that full, hard day and they get no pay, I think they understand this is an enormous crisis—the longest shutdown on policy ever.

So I ask a simple question: To those who are out working today, what would they think of working a full day’s work with no pay?

My good friend and colleague wants to put this in percentages, just a small amount of folks who are out and are being devastated. But if you ask any American as they get up and go to work and they work that full, hard day and they get no pay, I think they understand this is an enormous crisis—the longest shutdown on policy ever.

So I feel the pain of a partial government shutdown. It is people who understand what their job is: To secure our borders, to protect our communities, including our public safety, our law enforcement, and our veterans. This is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairwoman from New York for being able to recognize our task is to open the government, but we have no partners, and we didn’t shut it down.

Now, my friend talks about border security. I am on Homeland Security. I have been to the border more times than I can imagine. I know my border friends. I know the border States. And we have a way forward.

In a bipartisan letter, Texas Members of Congress, House and Senate, used the term “critical infrastructure” or “critical infrastructure.” But if you want to secure the border, you can have the moneys for opioid, gang, trade, and child exploitation investigations. Customs officers at our ports of entry, first responder funding, and the Border Patrol, include ice-breakers. That is the way forward, but it is ridiculous to do as we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say we are grateful for the Financial Relief for Federal Employees Act. We are the majority; we are thetempo. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that we know that people are hurting and that we should understand their pain.

So I want to acknowledge as a co-sponsor, and salute Mr. RUTHERFORD, who has introduced the Financial Relief for Federal Employees Act. Members are working, Democratic Members are working to provide some pathway for achieving some resources, by way of borrowing, for the Federal Government. So we are working.

We must open the government now.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member. Ms. GRANGER, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am sad to again rise in opposition to this bill. It is now 27 days into this shutdown and almost 1 million people are out of work, and we are still bringing bills to the floor that have no chance at all of passing.

It is well past time for a compromise to be found, but, Mr. Speaker, that requires a reasonable negotiation.

Many Members in this Chamber, myself included, have not put one single bill on the floor of the House to open the government. So it is not partisan; it is not rancor. It is not ten-
Trump has made it completely clear—in fact, he has offered negotiated positions and compromise, with no response from my good friends across the aisle. The leader, I think, made some great points about our adversaries, our peers, adversaries like China and Russia, and why this shutdown is a bad thing, which is why I ask them to come to the table and negotiate.
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Everything he said, almost everything he said, I would agree with. Those are the reasons we need to come together and reasonably negotiate. And I think at the basis of all that, we should remember what this legislative body is all about, which is security for and service to our hardworking, tax-paying citizens. We are 435 different voices from different walks of life, and we know the perfect agreement is rarely possible.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. However, making compromises and trading ideas would do us a whole lot of good right now, but that requires reasonableness. It is time to come together on behalf of the American people and stop this political bickering that is baffling this conversation.

Our country is in desperate need of border security, but we aren’t even talking about that now. We are not talking about the humanitarian crisis. Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I ask the Speaker to come to the table, find a compromise, and let’s get back to the work of the American people.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, my friends, end this Trump shutdown, vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 52, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. GRANGER. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows: Ms. Granger moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 28 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 5, strike “February 28, 2019” and insert “January 15, 2019.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit amends this joint resolution, changing the date of the continuing resolution to January 15.

This will allow Federal employees to get the retroactive pay they deserve, consistent with the Government Employee Fair Treatment Act of 2019, that the President signed yesterday.

The Senate will not take up, and the President will not sign, a continuing resolution through February 28. The President has made clear that he will not open the government until our Nation’s border security is addressed. But, the Democrats refuse to negotiate with Republicans. They refuse to come to the table.

This shutdown has caused real-world consequences for Federal employees, people who keep us safe and protect our borders. They are the TSA, the Border Patrol, the air traffic controllers, and the Coast Guard. My motion will allow Federal employees to get the paychecks they recently missed.

This resolution provides some relief to Federal employees, while we wait for Democrats to come to the negotiating table. We need to start working on legislation that can be enacted into law.

Federal employees should not suffer because of the Democrats’ refusal to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate, today is the 27th day of the Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in American history. Therefore, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

This continuing resolution would provide an additional option for President Trump and Senate Republicans to take yes for an answer and end the shutdown. This CR would pay employees; it would reopen government through February 28, providing time for Congress to come to a full-year agreement, without further jeopardizing vital services or the pay of Federal employees.

The order of business would be simple, my friends: reopen the government, pay Federal employees, and then let’s have a serious negotiation on border security and immigration policy. Maybe I will repeat that again, because the order of business is very simple: reopen the government, pay Federal employees, and then negotiate on border security and immigration policy.

It is long past time for my colleagues across the aisle, and across the Capitol, to come to their senses and end this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and open the government today.

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 motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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.

DISAPPROVAL OF PRESIDENT’S PROPOSAL RELATING TO APPLICATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 30

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on December 19, 2018, relating to terminating sanctions imposed on En+ Group plc ("En+"), UC Rusal plc ("Rusal"), and Sibur Nizhny Novgorod ("Sibur").

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5
legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 30, disapproving the President’s proposal on certain sanctions on the Russian Federation, under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that we are in this situation. It is the result of the Trump administration, again, trying to make an end run around Congress on an issue as important as Russia sanctions.

On December 19 of last year, the Treasury Department notified Congress of its intention to relax sanctions against three corporations tied to Oleg Deripaska, a Russian oligarch and close associate of Vladimir Putin. The Trump administration may have a perfectly legitimate reason for easing those sanctions. But the reason we are on the floor today is that we just don’t know. And, under the law, we have very little time left to get the answers we need.

The sanctions we are dealing with today were imposed under CAATSA—the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—the bill we passed 1 1/2 years ago to, among other things, slap sanctions on Vladimir Putin’s associates.

The law is written so that Congress would be able to step in if we thought any administration could be making a mistake in waiving or easing sanctions. The Republican majority at the time wrote strict and complex provisions for exercising that oversight, allowing only 30 days to pass a measure that could reverse such a decision.

Again: the Trump administration announced its plans to ease these sanctions 30 days ago, in the middle of the holidays, just before the President shut the government down, at the end of the last Congress, and before committees in this Congress have had a chance to organize and look into this very serious issue. This timing leads me to believe that the administration was trying to jam this decision through so Congress would not be able to act.

We ask the administration to explain this decision today. Their answers were, frankly, inadequate. We asked the administration to pump the brakes on easing these sanctions so we could review the decision further. They simply wouldn’t.

So, with that 30-day window closing, we are now forced to bring this measure to the floor to try to block the decision. It is too bad, really. I would rather the administration respected Congress enough to allow us the time to address our concerns. And, again, the reason for this were put into effect by the Republican majority in the last Congress, and they are good rules. I would rather they hadn’t dropped this announcement when they did—that is the White House—so that our committees could hold hearings and do our work the way we want to.

But with the threat that Russia poses to the United States, to our friends and allies, to democracy around the world, Congress deserves to have the other way when the administration rushes a decision like this. There are too many open questions about whether Deripaska will still control the companies that these sanctions address.

So, we are in support of disapproval before the clock runs out, and I ask all Members on both sides of the aisle to support it today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this joint resolution.

I have long maintained that provocations by Vladimir Putin and his cronies require a decisive and forceful response by the United States.

As the former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I love the effort to strengthen our cyber defenses so that Russia cannot attack our political institutions and undermine our democracy. I have seen the classified reports and I know the threats. I take a back seat to no one in confronting Russia’s malicious activities. The whole world has seen Russia’s aggression in Ukraine and its support for Assad’s brutality in Syria.

Bottom line, Putin’s Russia is an adversary and must be treated as one. An effective foreign policy needs to use all economic and diplomatic tools to confront belligerent behavior by a foreign power. Those who threaten America and our allies need to understand that they will pay a heavy price so long as these threats persist.

As someone who believes that partisanship should stop at the water’s edge, as the chairman often says at our Foreign Affairs Committee briefings, I don’t believe that this issue should divide our two parties. In fact, it should unite us.

This also means that Congress must guard against playing partisan politics with sanctions. We must impose them when they are warranted, and we must allow them to be lifted when they have accomplished their goals.

I think many Members find Treasury’s case for delisting these particular Russian companies to have an argument, but not very compelling.

For example, some still have questions about whether moving some of the oligarch shares to a family charity and to a sanctioned Russian bank will sufficiently sever the control and enrichment that he currently enjoys, and whether we can adequately monitor that with transparency.

Even though we may have a good-faith disagreement about the wisdom of this particular delisting at this point in time, I do want to commend the Treasury Department’s Office of Foreign Assets Control. They implement and police many of the sanctions that Congress enacts, and there are good reasons for their bipartisan reputation for integrity and professionalism.

But because we cannot be sure that we have removed the heavy hand of this Russian oligarch, I cannot support the delisting of these sanctioned entities at this point in time. Therefore, I support this joint resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who is a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I listened to my friend from Texas, who I admire, but he is defending the indefensible. Partisan? I rise strongly in support of the H.J. Res. 30 today disapproving the President’s unimaginable proposal to lift sanctions on three companies affiliated with a Russian oligarch oligarch—Oleg Deripaska.

Congress overwhelmingly passed the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, CAATSA, in August of 2017, to hold Putin and his cronies accountable for Russian interference in our election, Russian invasions of sovereign territories of other nations, and its other malign behavior.

Under that authority, the Treasury Department Office of Foreign Assets Control imposed sanctions on Oleg Deripaska, a close Putin ally, and several of his companies, including United Company RUSAL, En+ Group, and JSС EuroSibEnergo. In doing so, the Trump Treasury Department stated Deripaska has said he does not separate himself from the Russian state.

Deripaska has been investigated for money laundering and has been accused of threatening the lives of business rivals, illegally wiretapping a government official, extortion, organized crime, and racketeering. This is the man you want to lift sanctions on?

In addition, we have recently learned that Deripaska worked closely with Trump’s former campaign manager, Paul Manafort, including on a lobbying project that Manafort said would greatly benefit the Trump government.

Manafort reportedly also offered to give Deripaska private briefings about the Trump Presidential campaign. Does this sound like someone deserving of exemption from U.S. sanctions?

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, apparently, it does to the Trump administration, which has agreed to lift sanctions on three of his companies in exchange for Deripaska dropping his ownership against three corporations tied to Oleg Deripaska, a Russian oligarch and close associate of Vladimir Putin. The Trump administration may have a perfectly legitimate reason for easing those sanctions. But the reason we are on the floor today is that we just don’t know. And, under the law, we have very little time left to get the answers we need.

The sanctions we are dealing with today were imposed under CAATSA—the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—the bill we passed 1 1/2 years ago to, among other things, slap sanctions on Vladimir Putin’s associates.

The law is written so that Congress would be able to step in if we thought any administration could be making a mistake in waiving or easing sanctions. The Republican majority at the time wrote strict and complex provisions for exercising that oversight, allowing only 30 days to pass a measure that could reverse such a decision.

Again: the Trump administration announced its plans to ease these sanctions 30 days ago, in the middle of the holidays, just before the President shut the government down, at the end of the last Congress, and before committees in this Congress have had a chance to organize and look into this very serious issue. This timing leads me to believe that the administration was trying to jam this decision through so Congress would not be able to act.

We ask the administration to explain this decision today. Their answers were, frankly, inadequate. We asked the administration to pump the brakes on easing these sanctions so we could review the decision further. They simply wouldn’t.

So, with that 30-day window closing, we are now forced to bring this measure to the floor to try to block the decision. It is too bad, really. I would rather the administration respected Congress enough to allow us the time to address our concerns. And, again, the reason for this were put into effect by the Republican majority in the last Congress, and they are good rules. I would rather they hadn’t dropped this
stake from 70 to 44.95, never mind that the new chairman of United Company RUSAL’s board, Jean-Pierre Thomas, has himself defended the Russian illegal occupation, condemned by the world, of Crimea, part of sovereign Ukraine.

That is exactly why Congress required in CAATSA a congressional notification before sanctions could be lifted to prevent this President from allowing his inexplicable bromance with Putin to supersede U.S. national security interests.

Now is the time not to ease pressure on Putin. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 30.

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

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Neal), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and my classmate in Congress.

Mr. Neal. Mr. Speaker, 1988 was a good year.

Mr. Speaker, today we vote on H.J. Res. 30 to disapprove the President’s proposal to terminate sanctions on Russian companies, including United Company RUSAL. My colleagues and I have serious concerns about many of the questions that, to this date, remain unanswered from the Trump administration.

Russian oligarch Oleg Deripaska is a sanctioned individual known as a bad actor with close ties to the Putin administration. The agreement reached between the Department of the Treasury and these entities seems to allow Deripaska to maintain considerable control and influence of Russian energy holding companies.

A week ago, I asked the Treasury Department to delay the lifting of these sanctions to allow for Congress to conduct meaningful oversight. My staff informed me that the Treasury Department has confirmed receipt of my letter, but to this moment, we have not received any word from Treasury on their intentions. Given an expiration date of tomorrow, it is unlikely that we will.

As Members of this Congress, our duty to the American people is to exercise the oversight that ensures that the administration’s actions are, indeed, legitimate. We have a duty to ensure that an administration takes a firm stand on bad behavior by the Russian Government.

I think some of the more important elements of this consideration could be taken care of with just a few months of delay while we exercise our constitutional responsibilities.

The Russian Government has, time and again, prevented us from doing what I have just described. We intend here to proceed, even in the aftermath of the deadline today, and what the Senate did yesterday, to consider and to take a look at this act that we believe today violates the intention of our congressional responsibilities.

The malicious cyberinterference that has attempted to subvert Western democracies, including ours, needs to be fully examined. I urge my colleagues to vote for this joint resolution.

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

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Schiff), the chairman of the important Intelligence Committee.

Mr. Schiff. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the joint resolution, which disapproves the removal of sanctions against three companies owned by the Russian oligarch and Putin crony, Oleg Deripaska. Mr. Deripaska’s complicity and Putin’s efforts to undermine our democracy and those of our allies is well known, and this is without the benefit of what the special counsel has investigated and thus far uncovered.

Simply put, the Treasury Department has not provided convincing evidence that the deal reached with Mr. Deripaska truly ends his control over the companies. And the Treasury Department has not provided Congress with convincing evidence Mr. Deripaska will not, in fact, benefit financially from the divestiture of these businesses.

These sanctions were imposed last year on Mr. Deripaska and these companies, over Mr. Deripaska’s malign efforts to interfere in our democracy, as well as the efforts to invade Russia’s neighbor and the continuing destabilization of Ukraine.

The simple reality is, having imposed these sanctions as a deterrent, nothing has changed in the Kremlin’s behavior to warrant the relaxation of these sanctions.

Sanctions are imposed for a reason. The reason these were imposed was because Mr. Deripaska’s malign actions with the Kremlin’s malign actions. The Kremlin is intended to influence the Kremlin’s behavior. So what has changed that merits now the relaxation of these sanctions? The answer is nothing.

The Russian actions in the last election continued, through the manipulation of social media, to meddle in our democratic affairs. Violence along the line of contact between Russia and Ukraine continues and within Ukraine continues. Nothing has changed in the Kremlin behavior.

Nothing has changed to warrant Treasury lifting these sanctions, and so I join my colleagues.

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

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. Schiff. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on a bipartisan basis, and I thank my colleague from Texas for his support, and I disapprove this relaxation of sanctions on Russia and Mr. Deripaska, and to urge the rest of the Congress to join us.

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

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Waters) the chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. Waters. Mr. Speaker, you have heard all of the facts about what is happening in the Treasury Department. I do not understand, for the life of me, why there is any elected official who would support delisting these companies and Deripaska.

We are dealing with the enemy. We are in an investigation. Deripaska is a criminal. He is closely aligned with Putin. We know everything about him, and we know that he would benefit from this delisting.

He would retain 45 percent of the shares or the ownership in these companies. Of course, he will use that to basically pay off the debts to the bank that he owes. Can we know why we have Republicans who don’t understand this.

Where are they? Why are they not down here defending what they are going to do with their vote? Why are they not down here explaining why some of us think they are not putting this democracy first?

This is not the first sanction that they are going to try to delist. Oh, they are coming with another in a few days. It has to do with Jamaica, and I know all about that. And they are going to keep coming.

We should be implementing sanctions. This is about the invasion and the attack on Crimea. This is about all of the other atrocities that have occurred and have been implemented by Putin and the oligarchs of Russia.

We need to stand up, and we need to say that, yes, we are going to have sanctions. They are going to be implemented. We are going to make sure they don’t align themselves with the people who are undermining this democracy.

They have hacked into our DNC. They have hacked into our State electoral systems. And here we have people who are willing to say that is okay; that is all right; let them continue to do whatever they do.

The Republicans who did not vote on the Senate side need to be called out. This is serious business, and I want the Republicans to face up to it. Don’t hide down here defending what they are doing. Come on down here and defend your views.

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear, as the Republican leader of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that I support this resolution. I am not sure if my opening statement was properly heard by the other side of the aisle, but I join my
Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague and neighbor, Mr. McCaul, I hope that means that every Republican, none of whom are on the floor here with him to explain their position on this, will join us on this important vote, because this sanctions law against Russians was enacted over President Trump’s objection. The purpose was to deter Russian aggression against us and our allies, not to yield the right-of-way.

But now the administration is lifting sanctions on a thug who is linked at the hip to Vladimir Putin and who only engages in more wrongdoing.

Let’s not aid this one-way gift to Putin, a gift that was deliberately slipped in Christmas tree at the Kremlin on the eve of congressional departure so we could have as little oversight as possible.

Secretary Mnuchin suggested he was open to meaningful additional time for us to review this, but he has gone silent. He calculated that there were enough House enablers to rubber-stamp this sordid deal.

We sought a classified intelligence assessment of whether sanctioned Putin buddy, Oleg Deripaska, would continue to control the world’s largest aluminum company after these sanctions were lifted.

Leaders on both the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence have expressed their national security concerns about this deal, but Trump wants us to rely on tweets, not intelligence; on fantasy, not reality. If only he were as eager to reopen this government for American businesses and American citizens as he is to reopen this sanctioned Russian company.

Trump provides sanction relief for a sham deal whereby this one thug transfers his shares to his personal foundation. The businesses he controls were sanctioned under the Russian sanctions legislation the Congress enacted through bipartisan action in 2017. As I have sponsored numerous bills with Mr. McCaul when he was the majority leader to make sure that the Congress was on record and had policies which would staunch the attacks on our country and on our security by the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this joint resolution today because it is deeply concerning that the Treasury Department would terminate sanctions on companies owned by Oleg Deripaska.

Mr. Deripaska is a Russian oligarch—meaning essential is very, very wealthy—and is a very close associate of President Vladimir Putin.

The businesses he controls were sanctioned under the Russian sanctions legislation the Congress enacted through bipartisan action in 2017. As I have sponsored numerous bills with Mr. McCaul when he was the majority leader to make sure that the Congress was on record and had policies which would staunch the attacks on our country and on our security by the Russians.

The architect of this deal, Lord Barker of Battle, is a British peer who has increasingly become a loud megaphone for Russian propaganda and attacking our most trusted allies, turning Syria over to Putin, suggesting we withdraw from NATO, praising the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan with a distorted history. Each day of chaos is another day when Vladimir Putin’s investment in the reelection of Donald Trump pays him bigger dividends in driving to undermine Western democracy and our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, let us send a strong, bipartisan message, not just to the White House, but to the Kremlin, by rejecting this favoritism toward Putin.

Let’s vote today as Members of the United States Congress, not the Russian Duma.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Himes).

Mr. Himes. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the advocacy of Chairwoman Waters, but this is fundamentally not a partisan issue, and I appreciate the ranking member making the point. This is a reputational issue, and I want everyone in the Chamber to understand that this is about the reputation of the United States, about the Congress, about the Treasury, and about each individual Member who votes today.

This is a complicated deal. I have spent hours understanding this deal. But there is a big question that every Member ought to ask themselves: Is this the moment to relax sanctions on a Russian company; on a Russian oligarch?

Is this the moment to sign off on a deal that allows an oligarch to hand his shares to a Russian bank, which is also sanctioned and controlled by the Russian Government?

At the end of this deal, if this deal goes through, Mr. Deripaska will continue to own and vote 35 percent of the shares of this company. Mr. Speaker, you can control the company with 35 percent of the shares. But an additional 28 percent of those shares will be owned and controlled by affiliates of Mr. Deripaska.

Now, Treasury says that doesn’t matter because there will be somebody independently voting those shares. I have asked three times now, and Treasury has not told me who those people are.

So what is the rush?

There is no problem in the aluminum markets today. The price of aluminum today is lower than it was before this company was listed. This is reputational.

The architect of this deal, Lord Barker of Battle, is a British peer who has been denied access to classified information in the Parliament and who is under investigation by the Parliament because of possible ties to the Russians.

So I will just close, Mr. Speaker, by making this point: there is no rush. I think it is an expert on this deal. Members who vote against this resolution, if Deripaska turns out to be worse than we think he is, if Lord Battle turns out to be worse than we think he is, and if the Russians and Deripaska continue to control this company after this vote, you too will become an expert on this deal, and not in a good way.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Speaker.

The Speaker:
Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, let us reopen this sanctioned Russian company.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, let us reopen this sanctioned Russian company.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let us reopen this sanctioned Russian company, and not in a good way.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this joint resolution today because it is deeply concerning that the Treasury Department would terminate sanctions on companies owned by Oleg Deripaska.

Mr. Deripaska is a Russian oligarch—meaning essential is very, very wealthy—and is a very close associate of President Vladimir Putin.

The businesses he controls were sanctioned under the Russian sanctions legislation the Congress enacted through bipartisan action in 2017. As I have.
Unfortunately, when the Senate failed to get the 60 votes they needed to bring cloture so that they could get to final consideration of the bill, the Treasury Department decided to go forward.

It is crucial that the Congress, however, make clear that the allies of Vladimir Putin, no matter how wealthy or how powerful they are, face appropriate consequences for their actions against America’s security and democratic institutions. That is what this is about.

As Mr. Himes said, it is not a partisan vote. As a matter of fact, in my view, if Barack Obama were President of the United States today, this resolution would receive unanimous support from my Republican colleagues and overwhelming, if not unanimous, support from my Democratic colleagues.

Now, I understand the Treasury Department’s goal in this instance. It is trying to remove Mr. Deripaska from control of the largest aluminum companies. That is a good objective. I am also sensitive to the economic concerns of our European partners who are dependent on aluminum manufactured by RUSAL, which is the Russian aluminum company, one of the largest in the world and almost, maybe not a monopoly, but an overwhelming share of the aluminum market internationally.

However, I do not have confidence that this specific deal accomplishes that objective. I believe many of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle share this lack of confidence. There are way too many remaining questions for Congress not to act on this resolution.

For example, I am not convinced that Mr. Deripaska would fully relinquish his control of RUSAL under this deal—as a matter of fact, I think it is doubtful that he would do so—or that the Treasury Department used its full leverage to that extent.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Deripaska would receive massive financial benefit from this deal—this is supposed to be a sanction—massive financial benefit, nearly unprecedented for a sanctioned entity.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our action today will force the Treasury Department to engage more thoroughly with Congress on explaining its actions on this deal and seek a better one. I think their intent was an honest intent. I am doubtful they achieved it. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me and, hopefully, in a bipartisan way supporting this resolution and I call on the Senate to reconsider its position.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he is prepared to close.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and, yes, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was in the October 2016 classified briefings on the interference by the Russians in our Federal elections and in our Presidential elections. I condemned it at that time, and I continue to condemn it. I supported sanctions then, and I support those sanctions today.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, until we have been fully satisfied by the Treasury Department, I support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first say to Mr. McCaul that I am very happy to hear those words come out of his mouth. As you know, we have had a tradition of bipartisanship on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Chairwoman Royce and myself, and now with me as chairman and Mr. McCaul. So I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for speaking out forcefully and saying the right thing.

That is why Congress overwhelmingly passed sanctions on Russia in 2017, because Members of both parties understand the threat that Russia and Putin pose. From the illegal annexation of Crimea to the war in eastern Ukraine to the support to Bashar al-Assad to the attack on our own democracy in 2016, Russia is clearly a major adversary that needs to be dealt with strongly.

So when we see the administration—and I would say this about any administration, Democrat or Republican—how the administration appears to go easy on one of Putin’s closest pals, we understandably have serious questions. We need to send the administration a strong bipartisan message to that effect. This resolution represents Congress doing our job, exercising oversight and using checks and balances to the Russian Federation (Roll Call no. 42).

I strongly support this legislation that prevents the Trump administration from terminating certain sanctions on three companies, including aluminum giant Rusal, controlled by Oleg Deripaska, a Russian oligarch and close ally of Vladimir Putin. These sanctions were imposed under a comprehensive sanctions law passed in response to Russian interference in the 2016 election.

There are far too many unanswered questions about this decision by the Trump administration. Congress must fully vet whether these companies are no longer owned and operated by Deripaska or his compatriots. Russia must be held accountable for their actions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. ENGEL. 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.
that the program should be reauthorized for 2 years, which would have provided sufficient opportunity for meaningful engagement with DHS, stakeholders, and the Comptroller General, the Senate amendment authorizes the program for a shortened period of 15 months.

I am concerned this abbreviated authorization period provides less stability for DHS and more uncertainty for the regulated community, but unless we act, the CFATS program will expire at midnight tonight.

Allowing this program to lapse will be disruptive, irresponsible, and would sacrifice the important security gains that DHS and the regulated community have achieved.

In short, allowing the program to sunset would make our communities less safe. After all, this program is designed to prevent the next West, Texas, where a dozen first responders lost their lives after a bad actor caused an explosion at a fertilizer plant, creating a blast that leveled an entire community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Senate amendments to H.R. 251, the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act. This bill reauthorizes the Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Standards program, more commonly known as CFATS, for a period of 15 months.

CFATS is a vital national security program that makes Americans safer by helping chemical facilities secure dangerous substances. Under CFATS, security and industry stakeholders must work together to identify high-risk facilities and ensure appropriate security measures are in place to mitigate these risks.

I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle and in the Senate to develop a long-term reauthorization to protect our Nation and provide certainty to industry.

I thank my colleagues in the Senate for taking up this urgent matter to address gaps in Federal law regarding terrorism and other intentional acts against high-risk facilities due to their use or possession of chemicals of concern and at levels of concern—most importantly, for terrorism.

It was the focus and not a contentious regulatory arrangement. CFATS was designed to foster collaboration between the government and regulated parties. This program and its operations have not been perfect, but CFATS appears to have vastly improved in the last 4 years due to committed leadership and a vision for continued success.

What troubles me, though, about the other body’s amendment is it doesn’t give CFATS much room to make more improvement. One of the major lessons to come out of the hearings we had in my committee on the CFATS program was that, from 2009 to 2014, 1-year authority extensions froze private-sector compliance investments as plant security managers couldn’t convince their companies that the program would exist in the next year—this, even as many states had their own trade association programs that were supposed to supplement the CFATS program.

I would have hoped the changes that we are making to this program would not stilt the hefty investments made by U.S. taxpayers to stand up this program or potentially strand the investment the private sector absorbs when Congress makes unexpected and rash decisions.

All that said, the CFATS program and its authority have earned the right to continue. I had hoped a full 2 years would be what the law would be and would also provide the Department of Homeland Security the ability to demonstrate that its improvement is not a mirage and that additional progress in its work can be achieved. But we cannot allow this program to expire.

Mr. Speaker, 83 percent of my House colleagues and more than 70 percent of the Senate were not Members of Congress on September 11, 2001—the chairman was and I was.

Antiterrorism efforts don’t get the kind of attention they once did, and the fact that we have had no chemical terrorist incidents since CFATS’ inception is not proof that terrorists aren’t interested in targeting these facilities.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support of this program and the collaborative way we have worked together to keep this security program going.

I look forward to efforts to extend the CFATS program in this Congress. We need to ensure that these chemicals are kept secure, terrorists are kept at bay, and that freedoms are kept protected.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 251.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill to allow this program, which protects and secures our chemical facilities, to continue, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, if the House does not act today, an important national security program will expire in a matter of hours. I cannot overstate the threat that would pose.

As DHS Secretary Nielsen put it in a letter last November: ‘‘ . . . if the program were to lapse as a result of the current sunsetting provision, it would increase the risk to our country and create uncertainty across the chemical industry.’’

Before I close, I want to thank my partners in this multi-year effort. My fellow committee members, Representatives RICHMOND, ROGERS, and RATCLIFFE; my colleagues on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, Representatives, PALLONE, WALDEN, TONKO, and SHIMKUS; our new partner in the Senate, Ranking Member PETERS; majority and minority leadership staff, most notably Shuwanza Goff and Luke Murry; and Alicia Smith on my staff, as well as Jackie Cohen, Jerry Couri, and Julie Klein.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the speaker from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 251.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

VOTES WILL BE TAKEN IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.J. Res. 30; the motion to recommit on H.J. Res. 28; Passage of H.J. Res. 28, if ordered; and Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 53, not voting 18, as follows:

[Table of Yeas and Nays]

The Speaker designated the following:

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, for final passage of H.J. Res. 30, disapproving of the President, I am not recorded because I was absent on account of attending a U.S. Army Basic Combat Training graduation ceremony. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" to retain these sanctions.

Stated against:

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, had I been present for the vote today on H.J. Res. 30, I would have voted "aye" to retain these sanctions.

FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Speaker redesignated the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 322, not voting 16, as follows:

[Table of Yeas and Nays]
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MS. SLOTKIN and MR. JEFFRIES Should their vote from “yea” to “nay.” So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 43, MTR for H. J. Res. 28. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution. The joint resolution was passed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Costa, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Moreno, Mr. Velázquez, Ms. Adams, Ms. Spanberger, Mrs. Hayes, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Cox of California, Mrs. Craig, Mr. Brindisi, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Harder of California, Ms. Schrier, Ms. Pingree, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Carabajal, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Panetta, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, and Mrs. AXne.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Clay, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Perlmuter, Mr. Himes, Mr. Foster, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Heck, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. San Nicolas, Ms. Tlaib, Mr. Porter, Mrs. AXne, Mr. Casten of Illinois, Ms. Preley, Mr. McAdams, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Wexton, Mr. Lynch, Ms. Gabbard, Ms. Adams, Ms. Dean, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Ms. Garcia of Texas, and Mr. Phillips.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Sherman, Ms. Meeleg, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Rose of New York, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. Allred, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Ms. Spanberger, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Malinowski, Ms. Trone, Mr. Costa, Ms. Vargas, and Mr. Gonzalez of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Ms. Norton, Mr. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Ms. Napitalli of New York, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Sires, Mr. Garrienni, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Carino of Indiana, Ms. Titus, Mr. Sarah Patroce Maloney of New York, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Payne, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Desaulnier, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Carabajal, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Malinowski, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Macarosl- Powell, Mrs. Fletcher, Mr. Allred, Ms. Davis of Kansas, Ms. Finkenauer, Ms. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Pappas, Mrs. Craig, and Mr. Roda.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

House Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Velázquez, Ms. Adams, Ms. Spanberger, Mrs. Hayes, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Cox of California, Mrs. Craig, Mr. Brindisi, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Harder of California, Ms. Schrier, Ms. Pingree, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Carabajal, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Panetta, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, and Mrs. AXne.

House Committee on Financial Services: Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Clay, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Perlmuter, Mr. Himes, Mr. Foster, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Heck, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. San Nicolas, Ms. Tlaib, Mr. Porter, Mrs. AXne, Mr. Casten of Illinois, Ms. Preley, Mr. McAdams, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Wexton, Mr. Lynch, Ms. Gabbard, Ms. Adams, Ms. Dean, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Ms. Garcia of Texas, and Mr. Phillips.

House Committee on Foreign Affairs: Mr. Sherman, Ms. Meeleg, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Rose of New York, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Mr. Allred, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Ms. Spanberger, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Malinowski, Ms. Trone, Mr. Costa, Ms. Vargas, and Mr. Gonzalez of Texas.

House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Ms. Norton, Mr. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Ms. Napitalli of New York, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Sires, Mr. Garrienni, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Carino of Indiana, Ms. Titus, Mr. Sarah Patroce Maloney of New York, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Payne, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Desaulnier, Ms. Plaskett, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Carabajal, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Malinowski, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Macarosl- Powell, Mrs. Fletcher, Mr. Allred, Ms. Davis of Kansas, Ms. Finkenauer, Ms. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Delgado, Mr. Pappas, Mrs. Craig, and Mr. Roda.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Mr. GRIFFITH. Could the Speaker inform us as to what the privileged motion is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is nothing pending at this time.

Mr. GRIFFITH. A further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Could the Speaker inform us as to what the parliamentary privileged motion was that was previously referenced just a couple of minutes ago, that was to be taken up immediately, for which we heard no vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will inform the gentleman that the House just adopted a resolution electing Members to committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I appreciate the answer, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. That is illuminating.

A further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Can the Speaker advise me as to why the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) was not recognized to call for the “yeas” and “nays” on the previous question related to the continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We paused for a few minutes and no one addressed the Speaker for that purpose. We did not hear any request for the “yeas” and “nays.”

For what purpose does the minority whip seek recognition?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Kentucky make a request for a recorded vote, because it is our understanding that he did make that request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not hear any request for a recorded vote. We paused for a few seconds waiting for that to happen and it did not happen.

Mr. SCALISE. But if the Speaker didn’t hear the gentleman make the request, but the gentleman did, in fact, make the request, then can we reconsider the vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not hear the request. There was no timely request.

Mr. SCALISE. Then a parliamentary inquiry would be: Can we make a motion to reconsider?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As I recall, the motion to reconsider has already been laid on the table.

Mr. SCALISE. So is the Speaker saying that that motion would not be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this point, that motion is not in order. It has been laid on the table.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. SCALISE, may I ask a question?

Mr. SCALISE. Yes.

Mr. YOHO. Does the court reporter have a record of Mr. GUTHRIE’s statement? Can we have that read back, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. YOHO. A parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry, please.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to know if the court reporter has taken a transcript and recorded Mr. GUTHRIE’s ask for a record motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is authorized to consult the Record in the regular course.

Mr. YOHO. If that Record shows that he did ask that and it didn’t ask for a vote, is this motion out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled on this matter, and again, I was awaiting a request for a recorded vote and did not hear one. There was no timely request.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The appeal is not in order at this time. The Chair has already announced that votes have concluded. Members have left the floor and have returned to their offices. That request is not in order.

Mr. MEADOWS. I appeal the ruling of the Chair, again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no appeal available in these proceedings at this time.

REQUEST TO RECONSIDER THE MOTION THAT WAS LAID ON THE TABLE ON H.J. RES. 28

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the motion that was laid on the table on H.J. Res. 28.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Such an appeal is not in order at this time. The Speaker has already announced that votes have concluded. Members have left the floor and have returned to their offices. That request is not in order.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland seek recognition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there is a problem—and I intend to object.

We have told all our people to go home. It is not just a question of being in their offices, with all due respect. They are on their way to their planes. It is far after the time when we usually leave on a go-away day.

And I feel badly. I am going to look at the TV. I don’t, frankly, think—I was sitting right here. I didn’t hear or see anybody asking for a recorded vote.

And, very frankly, you don’t usually have to ask for a recorded vote because, when you were in the majority, it was always us that had to record the vote because we were losing. Frankly, I think that is what happened, I will be very honest with you.

But again, I would like to be able to correct this situation. But I cannot do that in good conscience because people have told me they had 1:30 planes, and they are gone. And I feel very badly about that, but that is the fact.

I don’t think any games were played. I am going to look at the tape—it is on television—and see. I understand the problem that most of you were not for the resolution that passed. We didn’t stop anybody from asking for a vote, nor could we have stopped anybody from asking for a vote. I was surprised that it went without a vote.

The Speaker and the Parliamentarian indicate that the proper procedure was followed, but the vote was not asked for. Therefore, I feel badly about it, because I understand the problem you are in. But I have Members who have left for the airports and they are not going to be here.

The vote, if it was reconsidered, is equally important on our side as it is on your side. I cannot expose my Members to missing that vote, nor will I. And I apologize for that. But I hope you understand that, given the situation, I cannot leave Members be subjected to missing that vote, which is a very important vote for them. And, therefore, I will have to object.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the fact that now there are a lot of Members who have left the Chamber.

But, at the same time, the gentleman from Kentucky did stand and ask for a recorded vote. Whether or not it was heard or not, we will, obviously, have to watch the tape. But it is an important piece of legislation that Members, I am sure, from both parties would like to be recorded on, not just to have a voice vote, which we are opposed to because it didn’t reopen the government with the sense of security, and, obviously, we are in the middle of negotiations that we are trying to resolve on that.

However, there would be a motion that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, would be in order that would resolve this for the time being while we make sure that everybody was not cut off opportunity to be back for the vote, and that would be to ask unanimous consent to vacate the previous vote and postpone reconsideration until we return next week.

Mr. HOYER. This is a very critical vote. This government is shut down. We think the government should not be shut down.

Mr. SCALISE. So do we.

Mr. HOYER. And the gentleman says he doesn’t think we should go home. Very frankly, there is nothing we can do, because the majority leader has said he will not do anything unless the President of the United States gives him leave to do so, and the President of the United States wants to keep the government shut down.

This was not a small vote, and I will tell you, had it been on our side, you would have heard us demand a vote.

Mr. SCALISE. If the gentleman will yield, we would have heard you and allowed the vote when we were in the majority, and we did, in fact, allow all of those votes.

Mr. HOYER. We raised an objection at the proper time and we got a vote. I understand that.

I will tell you—and you know that—you look around the room, all of your Members are not here. And, like my Members, they are back on the road going to a plane. I regret that we are in this position.

Mr. SCALISE. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, there are Members who have left. Clearly, there are Members who are here. We can compel Members to return, if, in fact, it is agreed to have the vote now.

But if it is not agreed to, to have the vote now, we do have, within our purview, within the rules, the ability to delay the vote until Members can come back that are not here. So for those of us who are here and want the vote, and for those who have left who would also like that vote, the majority does have it within their purview to work with us to agree by unanimous consent to vacate that previous vote, and bring it back for a vote on the House floor when everybody can come back.

And I do want to bring up that the majority leader made reference to the minority leader in terms of what we had been working with the White House on. The President has made it clear that he wants to negotiate, and the President has also made it clear what he is willing to sign and not sign.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, we are going to have a colloquy in just a few minutes and we can go through that.

The problem is—and I say this honestly, and I think most Members know—if I thought you had asked for a vote and the Speaker had not recognized that vote—I was sitting right here. I was not distracted, and I was not surprised that not asked for because I understand that most, if not all, of you were not for opening up the government.

The fact of the matter is that a vote was not asked for. We have gone through business, and we put ourselves in a very difficult position. But I cannot agree to a proposition where I have told Members: No, you can go catch your plane. Some had 1:30s, and they left right at the dot of 1. I don’t know whether they are going to make it.

And, you know, we are in a bad situation, but I cannot agree to a unanimous consent that is going to require our Members to come back from wherever they are. I don’t know that they are on planes yet, but they are going to be on them shortly.

And both sides have that problem. I think you probably have that problem anyway. And, very frankly, I am absolutely convinced the outcome would be no different.

The problem is so many of your Members wanted to vote against the proposition—I understand that—and I would like to give them that opportunity. I am not in a position to do so, and I feel badly about that, but that is the position I made.

Mr. SCALISE. I would ask the gentleman to yield. There would be an opportunity for you to do, in fact, that, and that would be a motion to vacate the previous vote and postpone reconsideration until next week, so that Members could be here and actually cast that vote in the Chamber when everybody is back. That motion is in order. If the gentleman would not object to it, we could actually achieve that.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be in session next week. We are going to be back here. It was a recess week. The reason it is not a recess week is because the government of the American people is shut down. We have tried now nine times—this was the ninth time—to open up the government.

Nobody was surprised. Everybody knew. It was debated on the floor. I spoke on it for 9 minutes. I think, for 9 minutes, if I was speaking to myself, so there was no confusion, should not have been confusion on the floor. And I think a vote should have been demanded. It was not, and I am not in a position to agree to a unanimous consent. But in a position to tell you, there will be at least two or three votes next week on opening up the government.

My presumption is those of you who have voted against such motions in the past will do so again. So it will not be as if you don’t have an opportunity to vote on this same proposition. It was not a complicated proposition, and I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I am not in a position to try to cure the failure, in my view, because I didn’t hear it, and I was, as I say, sitting here.

And the Speaker obviously didn’t hear it either. I am absolutely convinced that the judge would not have—if he had heard a request, he would have honored that request for a vote. So we are where we are.

I would urge the Members—clearly, I will stipulate to the fact that almost all of you would have voted against the motion if a vote had been taken, and you can put that in the RECORD.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

FAIRNESS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE AISLE

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, for whatever reasons, people want to vote and, either because they don’t get down the aisle or they don’t request a vote, they do not get the opportunity to vote on issues that they think are important to them.

From time to time, frankly, on our side we have felt that we have been shut out when the majority was in the hands of the Republicans. We would
want fairness. In return, we ought to extend fairness.

There are obviously many, many Members who wanted to vote on the continuing resolution which was the subject of one of the votes, but from our point of view—and having reviewed the tape—that did not happen. That happens.

But because we want to assure Mem-
bers on both sides of the aisle that their opinion can be expressed as they would wish it to be expressed—and I think Mr. SCALISE will say that. Mr. BUTTERFIELD, former judge, who is one of our fairest and best Members, I hope we would acknowledge that he handled the matter fairly and consistent with the rules.

Given that, it will be my intention to now ask for unanimous consent to provide for the opportunity, when we return on Wednesday, so that we have all Members here—we are going to return on Tuesday. And I would say that we will have that. We may maybe see a tape tomorrow if we can open up government, if we have an agreement on that. But we will return as soon as that option is available to us.

But we will return, if that does not happen, the opening of Tuesday at 6:30, and we will then, as a result of the unanimous consent request I am about to make, vote—revote—on the issue at hand on Wednesday at the first of business.

VACATING VOTE ON H.J. RES. 28, FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate proceedings by which the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, was passed, and to provide that direction on what was in order for motions to make, the Speaker pro tempore was incredibly fair in those deliberations.

I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for that fairness. I am sure that, had I ever had to go before you as a judge in those days, but I respect your friendship and your fairness, as well as the fairness to the gentleman from Maryland.

I do recall a number of occasions when we were in the majority where there were times where maybe a Member wasn’t recorded on a vote. They might have just gotten in as the vote was closed and wanted to have reconsideration, and, after conversation, it is always the right thing to do to make sure that these proceedings go in accordance with the requests of the Members to be recorded, whether we win or lose.

Maybe over the weekend I will have the opportunity to whip some more votes, and we might prevail, but at least to have that opportunity to vote.

Mr. HOYER. Don’t say that too strongly, lest I withdraw the unanimous consent request.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to get too carried away, but I appreciate that we were able to resolve this. And, again, I know tensions got a little heated because these are important issues. We want to get a resolution to get the government back opened.

Obviously, we have some disagreement over the border security component of these negotiations, and we will keep these negotiations going forward and hopefully get a resolution as quickly as possible.

But, in the meantime, to be able to get that recorded vote on H.J. Res. 28 when we return and when all Members return, I think, is the right thing to do, and I commend the majority leader as well as the Speaker pro tempore for providing that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, before I end, we had just been through a very difficult week in which one of our Members was reviewed and disapproval was passed almost unanimously, I think, with just one vote opposed to it, on our side.

I must mention: I don’t want any argument or we don’t need to debate on this, but, unfortunately, at a height, I know, of a lot of emotion, one of our Members, a respected Member of our caucus, TONY CÁRDENAS—who is, by the way, from California—was met with a call from the other side of the aisle to return to Puerto Rico.

We ought to all be cognizant of the fact that we need to be civil to one another. We need to be polite to one another, even. We can disagree very strongly and, obviously, we do on issue to issue.

But we have been sent here by 750,000, give or take, of our fellow citizens, and I respect all of you for having been selected by 750,000. I respect our disagreement with them on selecting the policies that you pursue, obviously—I understand that—but I would hope that we could refrain from any implications which have any undertones of prejudice or racism or any kind of “-ism” that would diminish the character and integrity of one of our fellow Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of objection is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays ordered.

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

REOPEN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I am very proud and so blessed to have been born in the greatest Nation on Earth, the United States of America, and I am proud, for Americans’ healthcare or education. Instead, it is about the demand for Trump’s wall.

Last week, I voted to end the shutdown. The bill passed this House, and it sits in the United States Senate. Last year, the Senate unanimously passed background checks. Right now, what is the difference now?

President Trump has taken over the United States Senate, and now he wants to punish the American people by attacking our national security, our safety, and the lives of the men and women who serve our great country, expecting them to work without a paycheck.

Trump’s shutdown is hurting the Coast Guard, that, right now, is protecting our national security. No pay for the families. They are relying on food banks to feed their families.

The Trump shutdown is literally endangering the lives of workers like...
Mallory Lorge, who, without pay, cannot afford the insulin she needs to stay alive.

President Trump, I demand that you reopen government and you stop your shutdown.

### CELEBRATION OF LIFE

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

**Mr. NORMAN.** Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of life. Psalm 127:3 reminds us:

> Children are a gift from the Lord; they are a reward from him.

With 4 children and 16 grandchildren, I know what a special gift each child is. On the eve of the March for Life, I am proud to gather with my colleagues to recognize the important work being done to protect each life each and every day.

I look forward to supporting legislation that recognizes the value of life and provides protection for each life, starting from the very beginning. I will remain a strong advocate for the sanctity of life and continue to be a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves.

We should celebrate every life and cherish the potential each child possesses. As we March for Life, we show the world the value we place on life today and every other day of the year.

### RISING IN SUPPORT OF REOPENING GOVERNMENT

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

**Ms. STEVENS.** Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the worker. I rise in support of the nearly 15,000 laid-off auto workers.

I rise in support of anyone who has ever been called a racial epithet. I stand with you.

I rise today for the American taxpayer. Your government is shut down.

I rise for every Federal employee.

I rise for Tim Mach of Waterford and all other aviation safety specialists.

I rise for the TSA agent who was questioned about how he would put gas in his car on Monday. It is now Thursday.

It is now day 27 of this unreasonable shutdown. The American worker and the American taxpayer is wondering when their government will reopen.

I rise today because this is unacceptable. I have acted and acted to reopen the government, and now, I, from this great body, this U.S. House of Representatives, I implore my colleagues from the Senate to do the same.

### RECOGNIZING THE MARCH FOR LIFE

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

**Mr. PERRY.** Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of the tens of thousands who will march in support of life tomorrow in Washington, D.C.

### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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

**Mr. MCGOVERN.** Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

### STOP U.S. ARMS SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA

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

**Mr. MCGOVERN.** Madam Speaker, I am proud to introduce, today, H.R. 643, a bipartisan bill to stop all U.S. arms sales and military aid to Saudi Arabia.

Madam Speaker, it has been over 100 days since the Government of Saudi Arabia brutally murdered journalist and U.S. resident Jamal Khoshoggi at the Saudi consulate in Turkey.

The Senate unanimously condemned the Saudi Government for this heinous crime, but the House has yet to do so.

It is past time that the House clearly and unambiguously declares that there is a price to pay for such barbarity. Let it begin by ending all U.S. arms sales and military aid to the Saudi Government.

I urge all my colleagues to join me and cosponsor H.R. 643.
GIVING A VOICE TO THE VOICELESS

This shutdown is unprecedented, but we have an opportunity to set a new precedent, a positive one, where we work together on comprehensive immigration reform and border security.

First, let’s open the government.

HONORING HERSHEY “WOODY” WILLIAMS

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

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Hershel “Woody” Williams for his service and commitment to the ideals that made our Nation great.

Woody was stationed in the Pacific theater during World War II. A young marine, he fought in the Battle of Guadalcanal and in Guam, before landing in Iwo Jima on February 21, 1945.

On the day the flag was raised, Woody’s unit was surrounded. Under a barrage of enemy fire, Woody charged ahead with a flamethrower in hand, attacking the enemy and opening a gap in their defenses that enabled his fellow marines to forge on. We won.

For his display of heroism, President Truman awarded Williams the Medal of Honor. As part of his ongoing legacy, the U.S. Navy christened the USNS Hershel “Woody” Williams in 2017, and the VA named their Huntington medical facility in his honor. He also flipped the coin at the 2018 Super Bowl.

What a guy.

A lifelong West Virginian who resides in Ona, Woody continues to advocate for Gold Star families throughout the country. I am proud to call Woody a friend, and I thank him for his service.

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of 800,000 Federal workers and millions of Americans who have been negatively impacted by President Trump’s shutdown. Like many of you, hundreds of my constituents have written into my office to share how the shutdown is impacting them.

One of my constituents in Bear, Delaware, is an air traffic controller at the Philadelphia International Airport. He has been working without pay to ensure travelers can travel and continue living their lives during this shutdown, something he is struggling to do himself.

He shared how the shutdown is placing immense financial strain on his family and the needs of his child, who has a disability, that the stress of not receiving a paycheck and not knowing when the next will come is too much.

Our constituents deserve better. We are on day 27 of this unprecedented shutdown. Democrats have already voted eight times to reopen the Federal Government, and yet, still, we wait on the Senate Republicans to act.

BURN PITS ARE AGENT ORANGE OF POST–9/11 GENERATION

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, burn pits are the Agent Orange of post–9/11 veterans. Over 165,000 veterans have registered their names into the burn pit registry, something that is voluntary, but there are millions more of our troops who have been exposed to these toxic burn pits during their deployments.

They deserve recognition. They deserve care. And they deserve the services they have earned.

So far, our government has failed to fulfill its responsibility to them and to recognize the toxins that they have been exposed to, just like what happened to our Vietnam veterans decades ago, when our government ignored their exposure and the ensuing illnesses that came from Agent Orange.

When I was deployed to Iraq, the clouds of toxic smoke and fumes from the massive burn pit in our camp was a daily reality. I know the damage they cause. I have seen the devastating toll they have taken on my brothers and sisters in arms who survived combat, came home, but are now suffering from rare cancers, lung diseases, neurological disorders, and more.

Today, my colleague and fellow veteran, BRIAN MAST, and I are reintroducing our burn pit legislation to address this travesty, joined by Senators KLOBUCHAR and SULLIVAN, to make sure they get the treatment services that they earned.

SUPPORTING DIGNITY OF HUMAN LIFE

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today, I join my colleagues in rising to support the dignity of human life, and no time is more appropriate to do so than when we approach the 46th anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

Not only was the Supreme Court’s 1973 ruling a judicial overreach, it was an assault on a fundamental truth that is essential to our democracy, the truth that all people are created in the image and likeness of God and that all people have the right to life.

Protecting that precious, God-given gift of life is not just something I talk about; it is part of my identity as a doctor. When I graduated from medical school, I pledged never to perform, assist, or facilitate an abortion. The people of Pennsylvania’s 13th Congressional District have sent me to Washington to apply that pledge to my work in Congress as well.

STANDING IN SUPPORT OF UNBORN CHILDREN

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of the most defenseless among us, unborn children.

Since Roe v. Wade in 1973, we have seen more than 60 million fellow human beings lose their lives. This is the greatest human rights violation, largest humanitarian crisis, and greatest assault on inalienable rights of our time. We will not sit by and watch this happen.

As a doctor and a soldier, I have spent my whole life fighting to save lives, to protect the innocent. I work to see the end to this assault on life.

Part of that starts with ending funding to Planned Parenthood, America’s largest abortion provider, which performs more than 320,000 abortions every single year. This is more than one out of every three abortions.

Abortion must end, because America stands on the equal worth of every human being.
HONORING SANCTITY OF LIFE

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

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I am often asked why I came to Congress, and I have asked myself that very same question. Frankly not for the money, and it is not for the notoriety or the scrutiny that comes with that.

Ultimately, for me, it comes down to the honorable purpose of supporting the divinely inspired principles behind our Nation’s founding, being a voice for those unavailable or unable to speak.

There is none more vulnerable or unable to speak than the unborn, and there is no more noble cause than protecting or promoting life.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I stand today, during this week honoring the sanctity of life, to ask every Member of this body to use any and all influence to return to our Nation’s legal environment that promotes life and to return to a cultural environment that promotes life as well. Our unborn would ask the same, if they could.

MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, tens of thousands of Americans will rally in favor of life, because we have a moral duty to defend the weakest and most vulnerable. I will have a little more to say later on in the Special Order. But it is my distinct privilege to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), a great leader and a compassionate leader as well.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership over the years on the issue of life.

Madam Speaker, in recognition of the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, this coming Tuesday, I want to bring the real impetus of the pro-life movement to the forefront of civil discourse.

The pro-life movement fights to protect life, from conception until natural death, and we stand ready to support mothers who face the challenges of an unexpected pregnancy. We also know that abortion is immoral and permitting it deeply wounds our society. The cause for life deserves to be heard this week.

Lately, though, there have been nuanced attempts by the left to hijack the meaning of pro-life and impose upon it a Big Government agenda. We can all agree that the illegal ending of a life through violence is tragic and wrong. The reason the pro-life movement opposes Roe v. Wade is because the U.S. Supreme Court case permits the legal killing of our Nation’s most vulnerable.

The pro-life movement is at the forefront of human dignity. We know that upholding human dignity requires that people be able to meet their needs for housing, education, and nutrition. However, the public policies that lead to the optimal conditions for human flourishing are worthy of their own debates, so let’s leave aside the strawman tactics and have debates on those policies at the appropriate time.

This week, we are talking about the inalienable right to life, from conception until natural death. To all who are fighting to protect life, know that I am proud of you and behind you 100 percent. As the 46th Annual March for Life takes place in Washington this week, I am sure the country will need look no further than the witnesses marching to the Supreme Court for an accurate understanding of what we pro-lifers are all about.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her very eloquent and heartfelt remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I am horribly disappointed and ashamed that, today, taxpayers remain the top funding source for America’s abortion leader, Planned Parenthood.

As an obstetrician and gynecologist, I have delivered thousands of babies from Kansas. I dedicated my career to protecting the sanctity of life, and I firmly and unapologetically believe that life begins at conception.

There are countless stories that I could share today, and I can tell you that some of the children I delivered are now in college. Some are star athletes. Some are leaders at their church and in their communities. And some are at the top of their class.

They are nurses and surgeons, doctors and pharmacists, police officers and teachers, clergy and judges. Perhaps most importantly, many are now moms and dads themselves.

I know these stories because, as I travel throughout Kansas, I see the moms, the moms I have delivered, and I see their children. They are now adults leading their own lives.

What no one on this Earth can do is tell the stories of the babies that were aborted and given no chance to share their gifts with the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Dr. Marsh and Senator for offering this Special Order today.

Madam Speaker, every year, hundreds of thousands of individuals from all over the country come together for the annual March for Life, marking the Supreme Court decision on Roe v. Wade.

As a strong advocate and believer in the Word of God, I believe it is my duty to stand up for those who cannot defend themselves and lend my voice to those who cannot speak for themselves.

Psalm 127:3 says: “Children are a gift from the Lord; they are a reward from him.” That is exactly what they are, a gift from God that should be cherished more than any other.

We must do more in this body to fight for the life of these children. I, myself, have cosponsored and supported pro-life bills, but we must bring them to the House floor and always ensure that pro-life priorities are included in any relevant bill we pass.

I am proud to be an advocate for life and a fighter for the unborn, just like the thousands of men and women and children who will be marching along the streets of Washington, D.C., tomorrow. I thank them for their commitment to this important cause.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Appropriations Committee from Nebraska One who has been outspoken for the entirety of his career in defense of human life, as well as religious freedom.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH, not only for his tireless leadership, but his compassionate, passionate voice on behalf of half of women, saying loudly and clearly, consistently, over the time he has been in Congress, that women deserve better.

Madam Speaker, we live in an age of contradiction. We say that we want peace. We say that we want joy. We say that we want happiness, that we ought to be living in a good and authentic, committed community, and that we ought to uphold the noble ideal of human dignity. But we have to ask some difficult questions. We have to ask why.

Why, in this age of material plenty, is life expectancy in America declining?

Why, in this age of vast and accelerating scientific discovery and technological innovation, is the world still screaming for meaning? Why?

Could it be that we have to be brave enough, that we have to be bold enough, to look and confront our own contradictions?

We say we want community, but do we really care?

We say we want justice, but with certain exceptions.

We say we want liberty for all but, really, only for our own perspective.

Madam Speaker, the reality is, life is hard. Life can be brutal. Life can sometimes be very unfair. 1430

The reality is we have to face this together.

This is why the demands of community, the demands of justice, the demands of compassion, the demands of liberty say to the woman, no matter how hard the circumstances, what a gift you are and what a gift the unborn
life is within you. What a gift. What a gift.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. FORTENBERRY for those very eloquent comments. To our colleagues and to those watching this at home, I think he really has touched a chord.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Madam Speaker, Mr. CHABOT is the prime author of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban, a hideous method of abortion where the baby is half born and then is snuffed out when his or her brains are literally drawn from the baby’s brain area. I thank the gentleman for authoring that legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate him yielding. I just want to make sure that we recognize his leadership on this issue for such a long time. When I first came to the House, Henry Hyde was still here, and he was known as the father of the pro-life movement, at least in Congress, and Mr. SMITH has taken that mantle from him, because he clearly is the leader amongst all of us here that have been trying to protect innocent unborn lives for many years now, so I thank the gentleman for that. He does a great job for the people of his district, but particularly on the pro-life issue on a national basis and I think for such a long time.

Madam Speaker, our colleague, Mr. FORTENBERRY, just mentioned he wanted to thank Mr. SMITH also for always advocating on behalf of women, which he does.

I just wanted to make the point clearly that when there is an abortion, there are two victims, obviously the unborn child’s life who is snuffed out before they really have an opportunity to come and experience life as we all do—they are alive, but they aren’t necessarily conscious, obviously, and so miss out on 60, 70, 80, 90, maybe, plus years of life—but the mother is also a victim.

I have had many women who have had abortions, and ultimately later on, because of so much trauma they have had over their lives in dealing with it psychologically, have become strongly pro-life themselves, and I have met them at many, many different pro-life events.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank all those students and teachers and parents and clergy who will be once again here this year marching for the cause of life.

This happens every year. It doesn’t get a lot of attention by the media, unfortunately. Oftentimes there will be a dozen or a couple of dozen protesters, and they will have equal coverage to the 100,000 or more pro-life folks that will be here. It is a disgrace that that happens, but I have seen it literally over the years happen.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, BRAD WENstrup. He and I together will be joining with those pro-life folks tomorrow, and we will have at least 1,000 or so from our area. Our folks will be coming from Cincinnati and from Hamilton and Warren Counties back in Ohio. I want to thank them for their commitment to this cause.

As Mr. SMITH mentioned, I was involved and have been involved in my 23 years here in Congress. In fact, I wanted to get on the Judiciary Committee because I knew that was the committee where a lot of pro-life legislation originates.

So working my way up on that committee, I chaired the Constitution Subcommittee and introduced two pieces of pro-life legislation that became law. One was the Born Alive Infant Protection Act.

We had people who have worked in abortion mills who would come in, and they would say they saw instances where babies would be pulsed out alive, a later-term abortion, and they were found in a sink, in a closet, in a soiled utility area and weren’t getting any kind of what we would basically give as humane treatment to animals. Human early stage of life were just being left there.

Now, as a result of that bill, which President Bush signed into law, they have to at least get dignity. They don’t have to take extraordinary measures to keep them alive, but they at least have some human dignity.

Then following up from that was the bill that we mentioned, the ban on partial-birth abortion, a particularly gruesome form of abortion which is now banned. We think 30,000 or so a year doesn’t happen. That is the good news.

The bad news is all abortions are pretty horrific, whether they use some salt solution or whether they are literally dismembered and pulled out piece by piece. They are all horrible, whatever stage they are, because they are snuffing out that life.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank some of my colleagues promoting additional legislation, for example, the Pain-Capable, which essentially says that if the baby can experience pain, which we think is around 20 weeks, that you can’t go beyond that; most of us say not at earlier stages as well, but at least by that stage; or when there is a heartbeat, that we should also, if you detect a heartbeat, protect that child. And we ought to protect all these children.

I will just conclude with this. Roe v. Wade happened on January 22, 1973. That was the date that decision came out. January 22 is always kind of a special date, and that is when people are coming up for that date. That is the day I was born. My birthday is January 22. That was my 20th birthday in 1973, because I was born in 1953, but every day when my birthday comes around, I always think of all of those millions of children, we think about 61 million different members made a different decision, and so they have not experienced the life that we all have been given the opportunity to experience.

So let’s do everything we can to protect those innocent unborn lives.

Madam Speaker, I again thank Congressman SMITH very much for his hard work in this area, and all the other Members involved.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, a champion for pro-life, Mr. CHRIS SMITH.

Madam Speaker, I am a father of three. I am a grandfather of eight. As I often say when I speak to groups that children are an extraordinary gift.

As Mr. FORTENBERRY said, women are gifts; the children they carry within them are gifts.

Why don’t we appreciate them more? I often tell kids that children are the only thing God can make adults with. If we don’t give Him the right to come in and apply, you don’t want Him to run out. And they always chuckle, but I always remind them that they are created in the image of Almighty God.

Look to the Bible in Jeremiah 1 and you will see the quote: ”Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, before you were born, I set you apart. I appointed you as a profit to the nations.”

Children are known by God when they are in the womb of the mother. It is just that simple.

Our great Nation has carried respect for life from the very moment of our founding. Our forefathers noted that we are endowed by our creator with certain unalienable rights. You heard Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX talk about them.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is promised to each of us in our Constitution, in our Declaration of Independence; not given to us by the government, but by Almighty God, but given to us by Almighty God.

So long as those babies have a chance to live, they can experience those rights: the right to life, the right to liberty, the right to the pursuit of happiness. Everyone hearing my voice has that right and was given that right. Shouldn’t they be given those same rights?

Without the right to life, we are a Nation without the pursuit of happiness, without liberty.

The Supreme Court erred mightily in this decision January 22, 1973. We should be a Nation of law, a Nation of rights, a Nation of life, and yet we seem to struggle with that proposition. Let’s help us.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH for his diligence in this.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. WEBER very much for his very strong comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SMITH for yielding, and I
truly thank him for being the spearhead. Somebody has to take the lead, and he has taken the lead magnificently to call attention continually to such, not only an important topic, an essential topic that we as Americans have to decide.

There is a book by author Simon Sinek that says, “Start With Why”. Whys happen to us every day. The simple thing to start with is, Why are we here? Make no mistake: it is nobody’s plan that we are here, with the exception of God’s plan that we are here; no one else.

In January 1973, Roe v. Wade was decided by the Supreme Court, as you all know, and in the 46 years since, far too many unborn lives have been taken that could not fight or speak for themselves. It is our duty, our solemn duty, as elected officials and as citizens of the United States, to fight for the unborn so that we all have a chance at life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Every year, people from all over our Nation come together in D.C. to recognize the sanctity of life and to acknowledge that every life in every stage is precious. Many of those people are coming right now as we are here, driving here, flying here from all over the country.

We are going to have a lot of folks from northern Michigan coming here. I am looking forward to seeing them and greeter them tomorrow morning as they prepare for the March for Life tomorrow afternoon.

The commitment that they have shown, again, citizens from all over the country, bringing their children, bringing all generations here to march for life, that is a commitment.

As a father and a grandfather, I am proud to be a member of the Pro-Life Caucus and I am proud to fight alongside my colleagues to be the voice for those who have not a voice.

Madam Speaker, again, I thank Chairman Smith for his diligent work and leadership for the cause for life. I look forward to all of the work ahead of us fighting to defend all life.

I am especially thankful that the mothers of all my colleagues here in the House of Representatives in the 116th Congress, all 434 of them, my mom makes 435, I am so glad that they all chose life, because that decision decades ago has enabled us as elected representatives of the American people to truly discuss what it means, the sanctity of life, what God’s plan is, and what our role is as elected officials ensuring that God’s plan for future generations yields the young men and women who will someday take our places and thank us.

God bless us all.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman Smith for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. Berman for being here on the Special Order. We are so proud to have him on the Pro-Life Caucus. I thank him for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Davidson), from Ohio’s Eighth Congressional District. Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gohmert).

Mr. Gohmert. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend, Congressman Smith, for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked before about my wife’s and my first child being born prematurely. We didn’t know if we were going to get to keep her. My wife had to stay in the hospital and her and our precious daughter many weeks early to Shreveport.

The doctor there said: Her eyes are not working properly. She can’t see, but she knows your voice. She has heard it for a number of months now. It will give her comfort. So caress her, let her know you are here, and talk to her. Let her feel your presence. Let her hear your presence.

They said: You can stay a maximum of 2 hours before you have to take a break.

While I was touching her little hand, she took my finger and held it.

The doctor came along in an hour or so and said: Have you looked at the monitors? That erratic breathing is now much smoother. Still very shallow, the heart rate still very fast, but it is not erratic. She is drawing life, and she is drawing strength, through you.

I am telling you, these children, unborn and born prematurely and born full-term, they want to live. They want a shot at life.

I know there is so much out there: Oh, but a woman has a right to choose. But we should speak up for the most vulnerable who can’t speak for themselves.

That is what Ramona Trevino did, former director of the Sherman Planned Parenthood. She said what finally drove her out of Planned Parenthood were the monthly statistics. The most important statistic was how many young children, as young as 12, are you getting on birth control pills, because the younger you get them on birth control pills, the more likely they will miss days, but they will be sexually active, multiple partners, and the more likely they will get pregnant, and we make a lot of money off the abortions. So the most critical thing: get them on those birth control pills.

Where in the world does that end up being good for the child? Where?

We have people in China; they abort female children right and left. Let’s speak up for the females, for the unborn. Give them a chance. Let them live. You will be better. They will be better.

Mr. Smith of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I will just say a couple of words, and then I yield to my good friend, Dr. Harris.

Madam Speaker, doctors today routinely diagnose and treat a myriad of conditions, illnesses, and diseases suffered by society’s littlest patients—unborn babies—significantly enhancing their health and chances to survive and to thrive. Comprehensive maternal and perinatal care is critical and ensures that both mother and baby are as healthy as possible during pregnancy and childbirth and in the weeks that follow.

Yet, tragically, in the United States, we have one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the developed world. While unborn children are killed at an unconscionable rate, nearly 2,500 children’s lives are destroyed each and every day, about 600,000 in 2018 and more than 62 million dead babies since 1973. That shocking loss of children’s lives equates with the entire population of England, more than 62 million kids who have been lost.

This stunning loss of children’s lives has occurred during a time when science has made it absolutely clear that birth is an important event in the life of a child. It is an event. It is not the beginning of life; it is an event. And the miracle of life before birth is nothing short of breathtaking.

The first baby pictures today, proudly shared and displayed, are, most often, ultrasound photos, showing the baby alive and growing in the womb. These are not of newborns—they are, too, later. But the first shot that we get to see of our kids and grandkids are while they are still in utero.

The humanity of these children is beyond doubt, yet the pro-abortion movement, like so many, modern-day flat Earth society, continues to cling to outdated, indefensible arguments cloaked in euphemism.
Even the seemingly benign word “choice” withers under scrutiny. Choice to do what? Dismember a baby, starve a child to death like RU486 does, and then forcibly expel her or him from the womb? In her effort to facilitate the baby’s ex-termination, the pro-abortionists aggressively deny, and they profoundly disrespect, the unborn child. They loudly mock and belittle those who de- fend a child’s right to life.

Anybody in the pro-life movement knows what that mocking is like. Frankly, that harsh criticism causes us to work even harder and, hopefully, more effectively to try to protect these weakest and most vulnerable among us.

Someday, I truly believe Americans will look back at America’s abortion culture, which has, again, killed, to date, about 62 million babies, and wonder how such a seemingly compas-sionate and enlightened society could have allowed such a great spot that could not see the innate goodness and value, pricelessness, of that unborn child.

As STEVE CHABOT said earlier today, we know that the women are the co-victims. I and my wife and those of us in the pro-life movement do work with postabortive women. We love them. We care for them.

Just yesterday, I met with two more women who are postabortive and talked about the agony that they quietly have for so long. There are now many ministries that try to try to reach out to them to say: We want you to have a better life, a life of reconciliation and hope. You do not have to suffer alone. There are people who care for you.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) the cochairman of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding so obviously, on the eve of the March for Life.

Madam Speaker, let me follow up with what my cochairman has said. It has been 46 years since Roe v. Wade, a generation and a half. There is no question that there have been incredibly significant scientific advances in that time, advances that make the humanity of the in utero child clear and that we have to revisit.

The fact is that science has now put to rest the idea that life developing within the womb is merely a “clump of cells.” Well, I could describe any of us as a clump of cells, too. I mean, I guess, technically, that is what we are. But science now has gone deeper and allows us to show exactly what is happening and when a human being exists.

So let’s ask ourselves: Who exactly is human? It is an important question, because if you are human, you are enti-tled to human rights, and those rights are guaranteed under our Constitution. It is a critically important question: When is someone human?

Now, science has answered that pret-ty clearly. At the moment of concep-

tion, when a sperm cell from a human joins together with an egg cell from a human, a new human life begins. Abso-
lutely unique.

How do we know that? Well, in those 46 years since Roe v. Wade has been promulgated, Nobel Prizes for DNA describing DNA and ge-netics. We know that, at that moment, a unique human being has been formed with unique DNA.

My gosh, anybody who watches NCIS knows that. Anybody who opens a high school textbook knows that. When are we going to figure it out? Because, at conception, a new member of the homo sapiens species—that is what it is; let’s talk scientiffcally—ise verifiable by unique human DNA.

From the moment of conception, any test on that life will show it is uniquely human, nothing else. It is not a little chicken. It is not a little frog. It is not a little cat. It is not a little dog. It is a small human being.

Because of that, exactly at this point, we have to insist on that human being’s protection under the law.

This fact is not religious. It is bluntly, clearly, unarguably scientific, because over the course of a human’s development in the womb, there is now what we call ontological change, that is, no change in the na-ture of that human being. There only change is the change in the size. That is the only difference.

Despite being further along in devel-opment, adults are certainly no more human than adolescents, adolescents no more human than middle schoolers, middle schoolers no more human than kindergartners, kindergartners no more human than toddlers, toddlers no more human than babies, and babies no more human than that in utero human being.

We can’t allow the convenience and politics of abortion to obscure science. Humans in the womb deserve rights be-cause they are uniquely human. They deserve human rights.

The scientific discovers us, and may the Lord, who is the author of all cre-ation, encourage us today on the eve of the March for Life. In the words of the prophet Isaiah: “But those who hope in the Lord will renew their strength. They will soar on wings like eagles; they will run and not grow weary, they will walk and not be faint.”

Tomorrow, let us march and not lose heart for the sake of all the little hearts that are beginning to beat at 22 days after conception who require our advocacy. We must advocate for a re-consideration of Roe v. Wade as soon as possible to allow us to protect all these human lives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Dr. HARRIS for his ex-traordinarily eloquent remarks.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the re-mainder of my time.

RIGHT TO LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Bost) is recognized for the re-mainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, as a fa-ther and a grandfather, I know the love that a family feels for their children, and this doesn’t begin on the day they are born. It starts when you first learn that the prayers have been answered and that a new life is being brought into the world.

As we talk today on this particular subject, a lot of people don’t realize that there have been many things that have occurred in my life and my fam-il’y’s life that make this a very per-sonal issue.

Thirty-eight years ago, my wife was a junior in high school. I had just left Marine Corps boot camp. We weren’t married. She discovered that we were going to have our first child.

She had five teachers who thought that it would be a good idea, because she was such a good student, to not ruin her life by having a child. Those five teachers encouraged her to go and receive an abortion. I thank God that she understood the importance of life.

That child, who would have been abor-tion, now observes in the United States Ma-rine Corps and is a major and will prob-ably be a light colonel before long.

He also has a law practice in our hometown. He has raised four children. He is an outstanding citizen. He serves on the county board. He is a respected member of society. He is even studying to go into the ministry. I am so glad of the choice that she made. Her life wasn’t ruined. She might jokingly say: Well, I have still been with you for 38 years.

But she went on and she used her time when we were in Twentynine Palms, California, to actually take credit hours and sent that back to our home high school where she graduated in the top 10 of her class. As a mother, and as a youth minister, and as a business owner, she has shown others by example.

Really, as we move forward and we talk about this debate, there are other concerns that I have, and that is that we in this body and in this Nation need to realize that there are certain ques-tions that come up, such as, When does life begin?

Let me fast forward in our lives. Our oldest daughter, on July 26, 2002, dis-coverd that her twins were in trouble in the womb. Well, actually it was before that. We took her to a hospital in St. Louis. It was just after my son’s wedding, and she and her husband, who had an older child at the time, they discovered that these two twins had what was known as a joint communica-tion, and they were trying desperately to get those babies from 25 weeks to 26 weeks.

But on July 26, we lost Hallie in the womb, which then drove my daughter Kasey into labor, and then we held
Ellianna for 1 hour and 35 minutes as she passed. Now, we have had legislation that quite often says at that point, that abortion should go ahead and occur. Well, I have seen what a child looks like at 24 and 25 weeks, and that is not the time the baby needs to say that that is not a life. I do believe that life begins at conception.

It is my sincere belief that America is only as strong as the willingness to protect the weakest and most vulnerable among us. My family participates in the opportunity to help young women who maybe have an unwanted pregnancy, also to help people who have chosen not to choose life, and also ministers to those who have lost children. My daughter is in that ministry as well through a group called Tender Mercies Foundation of Southern Illinois.

But that is why I fought in Congress to eliminate taxpayer funding of abortions, and to preserve pro-life healthcare providers the right of conscience.

Tomorrow, we are once again going to have the March for Life, which is a pro-life movement that is growing stronger all the time, as it should, as science is proving when life begins. I hope that you listen and I hope that you get involved, and I hope that you understand that there is a need.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman Chip Roy.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I rise today on the eve of the March for Life as a cancer survivor, as someone who appreciates every day that we are given from the good Lord above as a gift.

I want to recount a story from a couple of years ago that my wife and I shared in “National Review Online”. What do you do when the doctor coldly asks whether you would like to terminate your child? Two years ago this month, this became very real to my wife and I and we wrote about it in the article in “National Review”.

We received a call from one of our dearest friends. She was pregnant. She asked me if I would be the baby’s godfather, but her words of joy were tempered. She then went on to explain a series of harrowing medical concerns, the most significant of which was that the baby might be missing a part of his brain which connects the left and right hemispheres.

She was terrified and she couldn’t ask questions quickly enough. Forty-eight excruciating hours later, the MRI was performed and it was inconclusive. She was told to come back again in 2 weeks for another ultrasound.

The next week, her obstetrician, a woman doctor, silently reviewed the file. Then she looked at our friend straight in the eye and asked her if she wanted to terminate the pregnancy.

Now, my friend explained that the doctor had asked her the question in the same tone that she might have used when she ordered a coffee at Starbucks. She didn’t blink an eye. She asked the question in front of her two little boys. She asked without her husband there. She offered no explanation or comfort. It was cold.

The doctor told her she had to decide quickly because she was approaching the 22-week limit, which is as long as you can legally seek an abortion in Virginia.

Our friend’s response was a source of pride for us. She almost laughed and then politely responded that termination was not an option. She walked out of that doctor’s office and never returned.

In a world where everything and everyone seems to be so sensitive about every word that is uttered, we have completely desensitized abortion. We use politically correct words. One is pro-choice. The pregnancy is terminated because no one wants to say that the baby was killed. But if you are ending an invalid pregnancy, I am not sure what other way to put it.

So how did it all turn out? Her ultrasound was completely normal at 24 weeks. Her baby was born. He is my godson. He is healthy. He came here earthy and he seems his godfather get sworn into Congress.

Choose life. Life is not perfect. But each life is perfect.

Madam Speaker, I include in the Record this op-ed, which was published on January 29, 2017, in “National Review Online”, co-authored by my wife, Carrah.

[From the National Review, Jan. 29, 2017]

A MOTHER’S LOVE AND THE MARCH THAT MATTERS

(By Chip Roy & Carrah Roy)

What do you do when the doctor coldly asks whether you’d like to ‘terminate’ your child?

For many people, January 2017 will be marked by the Women’s March of a president, and a march on Washington the following day. For us, every January is marked by two phone calls we received in January 2015—and by a very different story.

The “Women’s March on Washington” has already been all-consuming on social media. It was billed as an “inclusive” movement with the vision: We stand together in solidarity with our partners and children for the protection of our rights, our safety, our health, and our families—regardless of our vibrant and diverse communities are the strength of our country.

Sounds so caring—until you learn that “inclusive” and “diverse” mean that if you are pro-life, you are not welcome, and if you don’t attend or join in this supposed solidarity, “you can’t call yourself a woman.” Doesn’t seem as inclusive, does it?

In deed, it is wholly exclusive. In their zeal to shock and to trumpet a convoluted notion of freedom to have their bodies “left alone,” these marchers exclude the bodies of the unborn. What about the rights of an unborn child? What about the safety of an unborn child? What about the health of an unborn child?

Two years ago this month, this became very real to us.

We received a call from one of our dearest friends. Then 2 and already mother to two healthy, wonderful boys, our friend said, with an air of urgency, “[My husband] and I wanted to wait a little longer to ask, but something’s come up and we have to ask now. I am pregnant—and we want you to be the baby’s godfather.”

But the excitement was tempered by the strange introduction. Here’s what she explained to me.

She and her husband, having two boys already, couldn’t wait to find out whether they would add another boy to the crew or instead start thinking things that were pink. They excitedly drove to the appointment for the baby’s 20-week ultrasound to find out. A few minutes into the sonogram, the ultrasound tech held her breath, imme-diately, their hearts sank. Something was wrong. It was a long wait. Finally, the radiologist came back into the room and moved the monitor around with a blank look on her face. Then, she told our friend to get dressed and come into her office. She explained that the baby might be missing a part of his brain, the part that connects the left and right hemispheres.

She was terrified but couldn’t ask questions quickly enough. What do you do when the doctor coldly asks whether you’d like to ‘terminate’ your child? What about the health of an unborn child? What about the safety of an unborn child? But that is why I fought in Congress to eliminate taxpayer funding of abortions, and to preserve pro-life healthcare providers the right of conscience.

The doctor told her she had to decide quickly because she was approaching the 22-week limit, which is as long as you can legally seek an abortion in Virginia.

Our friend’s response was a source of pride for us. She almost laughed and then politely responded that termination was not an option. She walked out of that doctor’s office and never returned.

In a world where everything and everyone seems to be so sensitive about every word that is uttered, we have completely desensitized abortion. We use politically correct words. One is pro-choice. The pregnancy is terminated because no one wants to say that the baby was killed. But if you are ending an invalid pregnancy, I am not sure what other way to put it.

So how did it all turn out? Her ultrasound was completely normal at 24 weeks. Her baby was born. He is my godson. He is healthy. He came here earthy and he seems his godfather get sworn into Congress.

Choose life. Life is not perfect. But each life is perfect.

Madam Speaker, I include in the Record this op-ed, which was published on January 29, 2017, in “National Review Online”, co-authored by my wife, Carrah.

[From the National Review, Jan. 29, 2017]
baby who, she told us, “was growing inside of her, kicking, loving music, moving when the boys spoke toward her belly, doing somersaults when she ate ice cream.”

We as a family had put our friend in this position for a reason. She has a strong faith. She knew she could handle it, because God was with her. She told us that she knew “would know love, would feel love.” Facing her fear of the unknown with faith and love strengthened her as a mother and a woman. But what if it hadn’t been our friend? What if another woman had listened to that doctor, who made it feel so easy and acceptable to just “terminate” and try again for a “better” outcome.

We use politically correct words. The pregnancy is “terminated.” Because no one wants to say that she killed her baby.

In a world where everything and everyone seems to be so sensitive, we have completely desensitized abortion. We use politically correct words. One is “pro-choice.” The pregnancy is “terminated.” Because no one wants to say that she killed her baby.

But sadly, even today, more than 3,000 abortions are performed every day in the United States. That is more than 1 million per year. Since Roe v. Wade inserted unselected judges into the question of the beginning of life, 56 million babies have died at the hands of abortionists—56 million. Just let that sink in.

So how did it all turn out? Her ultrasound was completely normal at 24 weeks. They just couldn’t get a good read at her 20-week appointment. Her baby was born in May of 2015 and is completely healthy. It was a boy, by the way. None of us—but particularly his loving and courageous mother—can imagine life without him.

This week, there will be another march on Washington; the one that truly matters. This one is to celebrate life, and all are welcome, including the unborn and those who love them.

Choose life. Life is not perfect, but each life is perfect.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ).

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker. I stand before you today as we approach in the 46th anniversary of Roe v. Wade to speak on behalf of Americans who cannot speak for themselves.

Our Nation was founded on the notion that every American has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As legislators, we are bound to protect these rights, especially as they relate to our most vulnerable population, which is why we cannot ignore the fundamental right of an unborn child to live.

While Roe v. Wade may be the law of the land, I am here today because I, along with my fellow Floridians, disagree with it. I believe it is incumbent on this institution to debate the definition of life as well as our authority and responsibility to protect it. As a father, I have the privilege and have the privilege of watching my daughter grow from a tiny blip on a monitor, to a beautiful baby girl, and now to a strong, courageous young woman, the young woman that she is today. I look at her and I love her.

As a father, I have the privilege and have the privilege of watching my daughter grow from a tiny blip on a monitor, to a beautiful baby girl, and now to a strong, courageous young woman, the young woman that she is today. I look at her and I love her.

These children could have been future doctors, lawyers, Members of Congress, teachers, military servicemembers, anything they wanted. But, unfortunately, because of a court decision made nearly 46 years ago, we will never know who those children would have become.

Madam Speaker, as a veteran, I have seen horrible things. And, yet, I believe abortion is one of the greater tragedies that we face. One generation to the next, future generations will look back on this era in American history and condemn us for the millions of children that we have allowed to be taken. Because the truth is, each life, from the moment it begins to exist, is a precious person, and therefore, has a fundamental God-given right to live.

So on this anniversary of Roe v. Wade, I stand with my colleagues in solidarity for the lives lost, and I pray for the mothers and fathers that face very difficult circumstances surrounding new life.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for coming to speak.

Madam Speaker, tomorrow, we are going to welcome to this city once again, the most incredible thing in the sanctity of life. They will walk down Pennsylvania Avenue from The Mall and they will be well-behaved. They will be kind. But they will be rising up and letting the people of this United States know what they are concerned about the children in the womb that can’t speak for themselves.

Madam Speaker, over the years of my time in elected office, I have been asked by many people from both parties: Well, what do you know? You are not a woman, and it is a woman’s choice. Well, I am telling you that I hope that no women that I know—and I wish that would never be the case—that they would be in a situation where they are so scared of an unwanted pregnancy that they think that it would hurt their lives.

But my wife, my 2 daughters, my 7 grandchildren—my hope is that with my 11 grandchildren, I have many, many more great-grandchildren—that they will grow up in a United States that understands the importance of life at its conception, that science, which I believe, is now beginning to show what we have known all along, as one speaker spoke earlier, that when that cell is formed and it starts coming together, and then in just a few short hours or a few short days, and then in just a few weeks we understand that that baby grows to the point that they can feel pain.

Each one of these items are things that are brought up in legislation because why it is that we need to explain and understand and put into law what truly is life and where life begins.

I don’t blame the courts. I blame this body over the years. I believe God has the opportunity to say when life begins. But I think science has taught us certain clear factors about what life is and when life begins. My hope is that the American people will not only think about this tomorrow during that march, but they will think about it every day of the year; that they will think about all of the great wisdom that we may have lost in the abortions that have been committed over the last 45 years.

Madam Speaker, I want to say a special thank you to everyone that spoke here today and to the people I represent in Illinois’ 12th Congressional District. I want you to know and remember what tomorrow is about, and how important these young lives are, and why it is important for us to do our job as laid out in the Constitution, which is allowing life to be protected.

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

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania Avenue from The Mall and they will be well-behaved. They will be kind. But they will be rising up and letting the people of this United States know what they are concerned about the children in the womb that can’t speak for themselves.

Madam Speaker, over the years of my time in elected office, I have been asked by many people from both parties: Well, what do you know? You are not a woman, and it is a woman’s choice. Well, I am telling you that I hope that no women that I know—and I wish that would never be the case—that they would be in a situation where they are so scared of an unwanted pregnancy that they think that it would hurt their lives.

But my wife, my 2 daughters, my 7 grandchildren—my hope is that with my 11 grandchildren, I have many, many more great-grandchildren—that they will grow up in a United States that understands the importance of life at its conception, that science, which I believe, is now beginning to show what we have known all along, as one speaker spoke earlier, that when that cell is formed and it starts coming together, and then in just a few short hours or a few short days, and then in just a few weeks we understand that that baby grows to the point that they can feel pain.

Each one of these items are things that are brought up in legislation because why it is that we need to explain and understand and put into law what truly is life and where life begins.

I don’t blame the courts. I blame this body over the years. I believe God has the opportunity to say when life begins. But I think science has taught us certain clear factors about what life is and when life begins. My hope is that the American people will not only think about this tomorrow during that march, but they will think about it every day of the year; that they will think about all of the great wisdom that we may have lost in the abortions that have been committed over the last 45 years.

Madam Speaker, I want to say a special thank you to everyone that spoke here today and to the people I represent in Illinois’ 12th Congressional District. I want you to know and remember what tomorrow is about, and how important these young lives are, and why it is important for us to do our job as laid out in the Constitution, which is allowing life to be protected.

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

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOMMERT. Thank you, Mr. Bost.

This week was an important week in history as I was taught in law school that courts do not take up cases to merely give an advisory opinion, that there has to be someone who is actually harmed by some action about which they are suit.

As we know, in the Roe v. Wade case, at the time it was adjudicated, there was no justiciable issue. The plaintiff in that case now publicly states she was used by the pro-abortion groups, she was manipulated, and that she has suffered because of what the pro-abortion groups talked her into. She has dedicated her life to try to undo the wrong that has been done purportedly for her.

So I appreciate my friends’ speaking up. As I said, in my case, I will never forget my child, many weeks early, holding on, breathing rapidly, but denying everything she wanted to say. Most of us have seen the in utero photograph of an unborn baby, an unborn child, grasping the finger of a doctor. They want to live. They want to grow. They want to be. They want to know.

Though my child couldn’t see me with her eyes because they weren’t far enough developed, as the doctor said: She knows your voice. You give her comfort.

We heard testimony in our Judiciary Committee previously from a doctor who did maybe 1,000, I think he said, late-term abortions. It is difficult to take as he describes it.

Of course, the female body is not able to birth or get rid of a child without intervention, so if somebody wants an abortion of a child that is further along and is developed, he described—and I won’t use the detail he did because it gets me too emotional.

He would go in with clamps, find something that felt like an arm or a
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leg, grasp hold, pull it off from the body, dispose of that, reach for something else that felt like an arm or a leg and pull it off, because the body with the head and the limbs attached cannot be brought out.

He would rip one after another the two arms and the two legs off. Then, as he would describe, the last thing you reach for is something bulbous, and when you find it, you have to crush it so you can get the child out of the womb.

After he lost his daughter in a tragic accident, he simply could not pull another child apart like that. He gave it up and regretted all of those abortions that he had done with no feeling until he lost his own daughter in an accident.

I want to say I appreciate Majority Leader HOYER bringing up a request that people speak civilly about each other. I get pretty frustrated with some folks here, some in the Senate, and that is just my own party.

But I keep hearing—and we have heard this in the Judiciary Committee. We have had hearings on it. People keep wanting to say that the biggest problem is this rising anti-Islam hate crime and hate group that is emerging.

But we have got the numbers here from 2015, 2016, 2017. Even one hate-based crime is too many. There were 257 incidents in 2015 involving anti-Islamic feelings, hatred, prejudice, 307 victims. They include yelling, but normally, the offenses, there were 301.

But anti-Jewish, in 2015, there were 664 incidents, 695 offenses, and 731 victims. That is pretty much 2 to 3 to 1 more anti-Jewish hate crime offenses and incidents than anti-Islamic. One is too many, but I hope that people who are in the House will cease the anti-Israel bigotry and the anti-Israel hatred.

After 6 million Jews were slaughtered during World War II, before that and leading up to it, they needed a place, and, of course, it satisfied and fulfilled a great deal of prophecy that Israel came back. There are no descendants of anyone who preceded the Jewish people in that area currently alive. Yet there is so much hatred for the Jewish people.

I saw it in Germany last year. I couldn’t believe I was seeing hatred rising again. Much of it was from people who say they are not or it is being accepted.

Germany was trying to show the world how loving, open, and accepting they were, so they took in all of these refugees, most of whom were Muslim, and now they have all this anti-Israel hatred. So, hopefully, this House can set the proper example by stopping the anti-Semitic comments.

For heaven’s sake, I have been mad at Senator Graham over different things, but one of our House Members accused him of being compromised and then made allegations insinuating that he is really hateful. So I am hopeful that my friends across the aisle will be able to avoid going to those hateful places so that we can have rigorous, tough debate without trying to assassinate character.

One of the places we see a tremendous amount of bigotry, hatred, and racism is in the Judeo-Samaritan areas from the Palestinian Authority. It is unbelievable that, in today’s time, an area the United States is sending a tremendous amount of money, that we would be mute while the Palestinian Authority sentences a man apparently of Arab descent, Issam Akel. He is a U.S. citizen, indicted by the Palestinian Authority intelligence October 11 in Ramallah, and he has now been sentenced to life at hard labor because he sold what they say is Palestinian property to a Jew.

That is incredible. We are sending them money to help cultivate that kind of bigotry and hatred against Jews? Really? This day and time we are doing that? It needs to stop.

I have seen literature that is being used in Palestinian areas to teach children to hate Jews, to think of them, as Farrakhan said, like termites or rats, for heaven’s sake. Then I see friends across the aisle in pictures embracing Farrakhan as he has said some of the most libelous, and bigoted comments about our Jewish friends. Really?

I would share the desire and the hope that one day we really will achieve Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s dream where people are judged by the content of their character and it won’t be necessary to ask people on forms what race they are.

I think it is important to know if people are citizens or not because that is how we arrive at how many Representatives, that kind of thing. Those are important things. It helps a lot with governmental decisions when we know who is a citizen and who isn’t, that kind of thing.

Madam Speaker, that is why I had the picture the other day, earlier this week, of the huge fence barrier that was put up at the 2016 Democratic National Convention, because the people in charge there—and Hillary Clinton was the nominal head of the party, being the nominee. Those folks understood those help keep out people you don’t want in.

Nobody told the head of the Democratic National Committee, including their nominee, that fences, barriers, and walls don’t work. So they had it out there on full display because they didn’t want anybody coming in they didn’t want there, and that includes people who were not delegates or the people they wanted. They knew that walls, fencing, and barriers would work, but only if you have security there to watch over them.

So it is a good thing. So we had that picture.

Then here is a picture of a wall and a fence. A lot of people say Israel has a wall around it, because they do have some wall, but most of it is fence. It works because they guard it.

□ 1530

We ought to be doing the same thing because, if we allow this Nation to continue to have people pouring in, even thought they have not been educated, coming in illegally, they haven’t been educated on how you keep a self-governing country, and you lose it.
Mostly, in history, they haven’t lasted 200 years. That is about the end. We are beyond that. But we are headed to the dustbin of history unless we begin to teach all those here how you keep a republic.

And I know some have been miseducated and think socialism is the way to go—oh, it is so much more caring; you have got billionaires pouring in hundreds of millions of dollars—because they think, when all is said and done, they will be part of that upper ruling class. In socialism you never have just one class—that is the way it is sold—but you have the big, powerful, rich ruling class, like oligarchs in Russia, and then you have the ruled class.

Actually, I saw it firsthand as an exchange student in the Soviet Union. You have got the rulers and you have got the ruled, and you don’t really have a middle class. It is not a good way to live because you know that you are going to have a totalitarian government, as Khrushchev found out when he tried to come up with a plan to get rid of government and go just to the “share and share alike” philosophy. He disbanded the commissars because it didn’t work.

There is no way to ever go without a totalitarian government that tells you what you will do. When you have got the teachers and the doctors and the various other people who tell you how to live your life, you have got a totalitarian society.

And I know some have been misinformed because they have gone around jails or jail facilities. Yes, they work. That is why their home has outer walls instead of just some partitions in the middle of the home where anybody can walk in and around and through their home. They know those walls work.

So let’s talk about what most people in here have voted for. Let’s get the government reopened because we agree to do something to stop the death, the human carnage, the rape, all of these horrendous things brought about by drug cartels controlling our southern border. Let’s stop it. Let’s dry up the cartels.

And for those who don’t care about the Americans, if your number one goal is to help the people of Mexico, help the people of Central America as well, then you know a barrier will give the people of Mexico a life they deserve.

Having some trickle in—they have got 130,000 or so in Mexico. Having a million come in a year, that is still not helping the people of Mexico, and it is bringing down our own country because we are not prepared and able to take care of such mass illegal invaders on top of the million-plus legal visas we give people to come in our country.

Why? Because we are the most generous country in the world when it comes to philanthropy and when it comes to giving visas, because we know it is a strength to have many races, to have a middle class. In socialism you never have a middle class. It is not a good scenario.

But the one thing I loved about 9/12—when we gathered in our town square and we held hands, we sang hymns together, we prayed together—that day, for that day, there was not a single hyphenated America out there. Everyone there said, “I am an American”—all races, creed, color, national origin, age. On 9/12, we were one nation, under God. And I hope and pray we can get back to that place.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o’clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GUNNING, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WENSTROOP, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCALES, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. HERSHEY, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. RESCHTENHALER, Mr. GOHMET, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. AMISH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MOLLIN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BUBB, Mrs. CHENSY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BATES, Mr. ROY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 68. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. MOORE of Georgia, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GROVES of Missouri, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAERTZEL, and Mr. CALIFORNIA):

H.R. 385. A bill to establish a grant program to preserve the legacy and ideals of Muhammad Ali and promote global respect, understanding, and communication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KELMER, and Mr. MEERS):

H.R. 685. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Muhammad Ali; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. PETRIEN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 555. A bill to establish the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a task force on Agent Orange exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DRJALAIL, Mr. YOHO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FERRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GONZALEZ-COLON, Mr. BROWN of West Virginia, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. NORMAN):
H.R. 638. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide that any estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Committee on Taxation shall include costs relating to servicing the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 639. A bill to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, to provide that national Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to facilitate the disclosure of tax return information to carry out the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. PAJETTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MONACI, Ms. BROWNE, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHUI of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DELABHOUSSAOUI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALAL, Ms. GARAMendi, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JACKSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPIT, Mr. KUHNL, Mr. KUHNSMOOTH, Mr. LAWRENCE, Mr. LED JU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEB, Mr. LENTHALL, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McKEE, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MUCARELLI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEU, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCAHOS-CORTEZ, Ms. OMA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PERSSELY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHARD, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-CALIFAN, Mr. SARABANES, Ms. SCALON, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SIFUENTES of California, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 641. A bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SOTO of California): H.R. 642. A bill to amend the Oil Region National Heritage Area Act to reauthorize the Oil Region National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LAWSON of California, Ms. GABRIEL, Ms. OMA, Ms. ESCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 643. A bill to reauthorize the provision of United States security assistance to the Government of Saudi Arabia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 644. A bill to approve the settlement of the water resource development project in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWNE, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. COSTA, Mr. LA MALPA, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):
H.R. 651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the deduction for charitable contributions as an above-the-line deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mrs. WALTERS, Mr. DINGLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSU, Mr. HOLSTON of Indiana, Ms. HOSIN of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 652. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue a final rule based on the proposed regulation relating to the Programs of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE) under Medicare and Medicaid programs; 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. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. HASTING, Ms. CLARK of New York, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 653. A bill to provide grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support dual or concurrent enrollment programs offering career and technical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. CUSHEROS, Ms. JACKSON of Wisconsin, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide employers with a credit against tax for increasing employee training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 656. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and to establish a new federal credit to encourage the establishment of a National Infrastructure Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOTY (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 659. A bill to establish a gun buyback grant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 660. A bill to improve the health outcomes in communities through community-relevant health information and new health supporting incentives and programs funded without further appropriations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina (for herself, Mr. LAMAR, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BARKER, Ms. WAGNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JONES, Mrs. WALTERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. GROTHEER, Mr. TELLE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. SPANO, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 661. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance to nonprofits, foreign nongovernmental organizations, and quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organizations that promote or perform abortions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. FLIESCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. Ounable, Mr. HANNAH, Mr. MENCY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHN, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NEUHOUSE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON of Michigan, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. KRISINATOM, Ms. BLUNT ROBERTS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DEMINGS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAYER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RILEY of Illinois, Mr. PENGRE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MACKINNON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCBETH, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 662. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. MAST, Mr. BACON, Mr. BANKS, Ms. BEATTY, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CARDENAS of California, Mr. MAST, Mr. HUFFMAN of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL of California, Mr. KATKO of California, Mr. CARBO of California, Mr. KILMER of California, Mr. LODGE of Nevada, Mr. LOWRY, Mrs. LURIA, Mrs. CARABEN, Mr. CARBONI of New York, Mr. JACOBSEN of New York, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. ROQUE of New York):

H.R. 665. A bill to require the Attorney General to make grants to nonprofit organizations to offer legal assistance to certain aliens lawfully admitted for permanent resident status, DACA recipients, and refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARBERAGAN, Mr. BERA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DAWN of California, Mr. BROWNLY of California, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CASE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COPE of California, Mr. CROW of New York, Ms. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROW, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESCHOO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HASTINGS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LENTZ of California, Mr. LOPEZ of New York, Ms. LORENZEN of New York, Ms. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSU, Ms. MCBATH, Mr. MCDONNELL, Mrs. NAPLES, Mr. NAPLES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETITION, Ms. PLAISSTET, Ms. PORTER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SPROOZI, Mr. SWALLOWS of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMSON of California, Ms. TAUB, Mrs. TOWERS of California, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILD, Ms. MUCARSI-POWELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LITUR, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PLUMMUTTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 667. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation and the governor of the District of Columbia to enter into a partnership agreement for purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DELAURA (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARBAJAL of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HYAN, Mr. VELASQUEZ, Mr. FORTE of North Carolina, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DINGELL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BOMONI, Mr. TONIO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOPFREN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANGVIN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. DSAULNIER, Ms. ESCHOO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAMB, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SHEFF, Mr. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VEARY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. KATSON):

H.R. 668. A bill to improve the health outcomes in communities through community-relevant health information and new health supporting incentives and programs funded without further appropriations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
H.R. 664. A bill to protect the right of individuals to own and to use water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.


H.R. 666. A bill to establish a scholarship program in the Department of State for Haitian students whose studies were interrupted as a result of the January 12, 2010, earthquake, or the October 4, 2016, hurricane, Hurricane Matthew; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 667. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to provide a deferment for certain student loans of Federal employees subject to a lapse in emergency declarations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, for the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 670. A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of constructing a new City-owned, but by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

H.R. 671. A bill to require the SEC to increase its transparency and to make public all of its financial disclosures; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 672. A bill to reauthorize the Making Work Pay Tax Credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the United States Code to provide a refuge for certain students of Federal employees subject to a lapse in emergency declarations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

H.R. 674. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 675. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 676. A bill to reiterate the support of the Congress of the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 677. A bill to amend gendered terms in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 679. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 680. A bill to authorize the President to enter into a certain agreement with the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 682. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 684. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 685. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 686. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel cell electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 688. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 689. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 690. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 691. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 692. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 693. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 694. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 695. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 696. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 697. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 698. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 699. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 700. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 701. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
the treatment of certain coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, to require the sponsors of certain political advertisements to identify the source of funds used for such advertisements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RUPFERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. TAKAI):
H.R. 680. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to identify security vulnerabilities of certain entities in the energy sector; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself and Mr. O’HALLERAN):
H.R. 881. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the application of the official, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. GUTierrez, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BIGGS):
H.R. 683. A bill to impose requirements on the payment of compensation to professional persons employed in voluntary cases commenced under title III of the Puerto Rico Oversight Management and Economic Stability Act (commonly known as “PROMESA”); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VISCOSKY (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUCHON, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):
H.R. 684. A bill to retitle Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore as Indiana Dunes National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALDEN:
H.R. 88. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Bend, Oregon, as the “Robert Maxwell VA Clinic”; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DIETETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LENTZ, Ms. LOPUHIN, Ms. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McNERNESY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCHELL, Mr. QUADYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Ms. SHIRAS, Ms. WASSERMANN SCHULTZ, and Ms. MOORE):
H.R. 686. A bill to require face-to-face purchases of ammunition, to require licensing of ammunition dealers, and to require reporting regarding bulk purchases of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SHIRAS):
H.R. 687. A bill to provide for the mandatory licensing and registration of handguns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 688. A bill to provide for the issuance of a PFC Garfield M. Langhorn Memorial Semipostal Stamp to Benefit our Veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. MCKINNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. SHALALA):
H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the oxidation of persons by political advertisements as contributions to candidates, to require the sponsors of certain political advertisements to identify the source of funds used for such advertisements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:
H. Res. 57. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives, as agreed to.

By Mr. O’HALLERAN (for himself and Mrs. HAYES):
H. Res. 58. A resolution supporting the goal of increasing public school teacher pay and public education funding; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. LEE (for herself, Mr. BUDD, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BULIKAKIS, Mr. GIFFRTH, and Ms. BROOKS of Indiana):
H. Res. 59. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Medicare and Social Security provide an essential benefit for current enrollees and should be strengthened for future generations; 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. MCKINLEY (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. GABBAH):
H. Res. 60. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take all appropriate measures to restore service standards, as determined by the Postal Service, on July 1, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 20. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress’s power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN:
H.R. 634. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Art. Amendment V, Section 1— the “Due Process” clause protects any life from being taken without due process of law; this legislation provides unborn citizens a modicum of due process.

By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.R. 635. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.R. 636. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KATKO:
H.R. 637. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I Section 8 Clause 1: 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.

By Mr. CLOUD:
H.R. 638. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, accompanying this power Congress the authority to spend, and raise revenue. Therefore, the cost estimating agencies should provide Congress with the cost of servicing our debt and a list of activities currently performed by federal agencies that would be duplicated by a piece of legislation under consideration.

By Mr. HARTZLER:
H.R. 639. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Necessary and proper clause, Article 1, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 640. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LOFGREN:
H.R. 641. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a “uniform rule of Naturalization.”

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 642. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. MCGOVERN:
H.R. 643. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, Clause 12 and Clause 18.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.R. 644. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, clause 3 and 4.

By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 645. 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. CALVERT:
H.R. 646. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Art. 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. ENGEL:
H.R. 657.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Mrs. LOWEY:
H.R. 646.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:
“No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .
In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:
“The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .”
Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.
By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 651.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.
By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 652.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article I, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”
By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 651.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.
By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:
H.R. 653.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18).
By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:
H.R. 654.
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. 655.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment XVI
By Mr. CORREA:
H.R. 656.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
(i) The U.S. Constitution including Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. COX of California:
H.R. 657.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. DeLAURO:
H.R. 658.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. DEUTCH:
H.R. 659.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:
H.R. 660.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:
H.R. 661.
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 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 662.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 663.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United States Constitution including Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.
By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution Article I Section 8.
By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:
H.R. 667.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 668.
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 Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
H.R. 669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:
H.R. 661.
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 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 662.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 663.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United States Constitution including Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.
By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution Article I Section 8.
By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:
H.R. 667.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 668.
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 Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
H.R. 669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:
H.R. 661.
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 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FUDGE:
H.R. 662.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 663.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United States Constitution including Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.
By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution Article I Section 8.
By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:
H.R. 667.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 668.
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 Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
H.R. 669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:
H.R. 661.
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 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. FUDGE:
H.R. 662.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 663.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United States Constitution including Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.
By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution Article I Section 8.
By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:
H.R. 667.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 668.
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 Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 665.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
H.R. 669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina:
H.R. 661.
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 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. FUDGE:
H.R. 662.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 663.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United States Constitution including Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 664.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 8: Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BHARTIOGRA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. GIBRS of Texas, Mr. MERRKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WALTER, Ms. GOMAR, Ms. JAYAFAL, Ms. KAPUTH, RUIZ, Ms. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LOEBECK, Mr. DELLA, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 31: Mr. VSCLOYSK and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 38: Mrs. HARTZLE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 51: Mr. KIM and Ms. MUCARSEL-POW.

H.R. 58: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 95: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. STAIR, Ms. TLAIR, Mr. SENCHBRENNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BASS, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. PLASKITT.

H.R. 117: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 139: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 141: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 156: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. EMER.

H.R. 154: Mr. LANKOV.

H.R. 155: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 167: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. RUDAI.

H.R. 169: Ms. PLASKITT.

H.R. 172: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 186: Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. ESCALAT, Mr. RYAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SIEBES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SHON PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CÁRDEES, Ms. GASSARD, and Mr. KRISHNAMURTHI.

H.R. 23: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 243: Mr. McCLEONSTOCK.

H.R. 256: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 257: Ms. STEFANIC, Mr. ESHOO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 293: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MERRKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPALAT, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 273: Mr. LOWENSTEIN.

H.R. 278: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 294: Mr. RYAN and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 295: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 296: Mr. McNICHOL.

H.R. 299: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BARN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SENCHBRENNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. GAINFORT, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHEARMAN, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 301: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 309: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 310: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 312: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Ms. PINO.

H.R. 339: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ALABAMA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPALAT, and Mr. S EAN PATR.

H.R. 361: Mr. KIN of New York.

H.R. 367: Mr. BARR, Mr. PAPAS, Mr. MEACHIN, Mr. VASHEY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. YAR, MUTH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERA, Mr. KIN of New York, Mr. PINO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 369: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 388: Mr. HILL of Arkansas.

H.R. 415: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 473: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 477: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LUTKEMYER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. KATKO, Ms. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 511: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MUCARSEL-

H.R. 512: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. ROY.

H.R. 515: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. PINO.

H.R. 516: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 549: Ms. SHALALA and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 553: Mr. DIETZ and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 558: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 584: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 587: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LAMB, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 590: Mr. PETERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 592: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 603: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. GIBBS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 615: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 616: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROY, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 617: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 621: Mr. LONG, Mr. GORMERT, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.J. Res. 2: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BLOOMN.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 23: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. GABBRAD, and Ms. SCHARK.

H.R. 33: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SWALWEL of California, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEACHIN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SWELL of Alabama, Ms. SCHAK.

H.R. 35: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 47: Mr. GORMERT, Mr. MOON of West Virginia, and Mr. SCHWEIK.

H.R. 49: Ms. MENG, Mr. CHAROP, and Mr. HICE of Georgia.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OPPOSED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.R. 484, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:
Eternal Father, answer our prayers, for Your unflinching love sustains us.

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. BAUMN). The majority leader is recognized.

S. 109
Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, tomorrow Washington will play host to one of our Nation’s proudest examples of peaceful activism: the 49th annual March for Life.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans—from different States, different faiths, different ethnic backgrounds—will speak with one voice on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. I would like to welcome the marchers, especially my fellow Kentuckians, including Margie Montgomery, executive director of Kentucky Right to Life. I welcome all the marchers with gratitude. I am grateful they are helping shed light on this great shame of our society and bearing witness to the fact that human dignity and human rights are for everyone.

As they march tomorrow, our friends can take pride in knowing our beliefs are not just consistent with morality and supported by science; they are also squarely within the mainstream of our society. According to one recent survey, a sizable majority of American adults hold views on the subject that are far, far from the absolutist position of the far left.

Seventy-five percent of all Americans, including more than 60 percent of those who call themselves pro-choice, support more protection for the lives of unborn children. The far left is wedded to the most extreme positions on this subject. For example, the radical left wants America to remain one of only seven—seven—countries in the entire world, including China and North Korea, that allow elective abortions to occur after 20 weeks and even after the child is capable of feeling pain. The American people, however, know better. That survey also found that a majority of Americans oppose taxpayer-funded abortions.

So I am proud today to stand with that majority of Americans and urge every Member of this body to join me in supporting the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act this afternoon.

Thanks to the dedication of Senators WICKER, ROBERTS, ERNST, LANKFORD, DAINES, BLUNT, and many others, the bill before us would supplement existing law and bolster the important, longstanding protections of the Hyde amendment.

By implementing a governmentwide, statutory prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion and abortion coverage, S. 109 would close off Federal support for abortion that flows outside of the Hyde-protected regular appropriations process.

In addition, it would explicitly ensure that Federal healthcare facilities are not party to abortions and increase transparency requirements for federally subsidized healthcare plans.

I am proud to support this important step forward in protecting Americans’ rights of conscience, and I urge every one of our colleagues to vote to advance it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

S. 109
Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the fact that the United States is debating and voting on this bill attacking women’s healthcare right now is an absolute disgrace.

We are 27 days into President Trump’s completely unnecessary government shutdown. Workers are not being paid. Families are huddled around their tables, wondering which bills to pay and which expenses to cut. Our national security is being impacted. Our parks are filling up with trash. Our economy is losing billions of dollars. The list goes on. It needs to end.

I urge my colleagues, vote no against this bill today that would erode women’s healthcare and take away our constitutionally protected rights. Demand that Republican leaders let us vote to open the government, and then let’s get back to work getting our country back on track.

I yield the floor.
RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I want to echo the words of my colleague, our great ranking member of Health and Human Services, Senator MURRAY.

Now, look, folks. As the Trump shutdown drags into its 27th day, the pain inflicted on our country, our citizens, and our economy grows. The Council of Economic Advisers said the shutdown would hurt our economy twice as much as originally projected. Experts are predicting it could wipe out the entire first quarter of economic growth.

At airports, an understaffed TSA means longer and longer lines. Yesterday, the executive vice president of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association said that flying “is less safe today than a month ago, absolutely.”

Hundreds of thousands of public servants are suffering. I can give a list of a long number. President Trump, this shutdown—your shutdown—has gone on too long. Why is President Trump punishing folks like so many of my constituents who have nothing to do with disagreements about borders?

If you sense exasperation in my tone, you are right. We Democrats are exasperated. All we want to do is reopen the government. We are happy to debate border security with the President and our Republican colleagues—happy to. But let’s reopen the government.

My Republican friends here, both the President and Leader MCCONNELL, are ignoring the overwhelming will of the American people. We urge our colleagues to think about this. We know that President Trump is not interested in ending the shutdown. Leader MCCONNELL knows he has the power to end the shutdown. The only reason we are in this prolonged stalemate is that my understanding was different, and in this case far more courageous.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 11, S. 109, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, James M. Inhofe, John Barasso, David Perdue, John Kennedy, John Thune, Thom Tillis, James E. Risch, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, James Lankford, Michael B. Enzi, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn. The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 109, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 11, S. 109, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.


The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 47, as follows:

[Brief list of Senators voting aye and not voting]

CLOSER CONSIDERATION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND ABORTION INSURANCE FULL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 109, which the clerk will report.
So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 14, H.J. Res. 30; that the joint resolution be considered read for a third time and the Senate vote on passage with a 60-vote affirmative threshold, with six votes necessary to sustain a motion to recommit; and that if the joint resolution fails to achieve 60 votes for passage, it be returned to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 5, H.R. 21, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the preceding motion, but having violated that rule, I would like to yield my time to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. Udall. Senator Kaine is yielding to me to talk about the Interior Department in the bill. Let me just thank him for his vigilance. When we have 800,000 Federal employees across this country and their families hurting, he has been vigilant with this. I know that in the Commonwealth of Virginia he and Senator Warner are very involved, and they are Senator Heinrich and myself about what is happening in New Mexico. I want to speak a little bit about the Interior Department bill, where I am the ranking Democrat.

I rise today to call on this body to take action and immediately end the shutdown that is causing tragic consequences in the lives of Americans. We are on day 27 of the shutdown, the longest in our Nation’s history.

Every day my constituents in New Mexico are asking me what are we doing to end this senseless shutdown. So I am here on the Senate floor demanding that we open the government, demanding that we do our jobs as a co-equal branch of government, demanding that we pass bipartisan appropriations bills.

I have the privilege of serving as the ranking member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and I know how critical the Interior bill is, particularly in New Mexico and to States across the West and across the country. The Interior bill funds basic services like healthcare and public safety for 2 million American Indians and Alaska Natives through the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

This bill keeps our water and air clean through the work of the Environmental Protection Agency. This bill protects and preserves national parks and other treasured public lands and helps to support small businesses that depend on them. The Agencies in this bill fund science, wildlife protection, energy development, arts and cultural programs in every State, and they employ tens of thousands of Americans. There is no reason why they should be shuttered. They are simply too important.

This shutdown is particularly devastating for Indian Country. Every day the President continues to treat Tribal programs like hostages for political gain. By his action he endangers families across Indian Country. Multiple health clinics that serve urban Indians have had to turn hundreds of patients away. Tribal court programs are in jeopardy. Food distribution and social service programs are on the chopping block. Law enforcement services are stretched to the breaking point. Thousands of Tribal members are furloughed—all to devastating effect.

Indian Country is paying the price for every day that the President’s reckless shutdown continues. These are people who are living on the line. Our government is completely failing to uphold its trust and treaty obligations to Native Americans, and all for what? A wildly expensive and ineffective wall that this Nation doesn’t want and a vanity project for a President who is not putting the best interests of this country first. It doesn’t make any sense.

We need to pass the Interior appropriations bill so we can reopen the entire National Park System along with other public lands, and do so safely. Already, we have heard about the tragic impacts of the shutdown on our parks, including thousand-year-old Joshua trees cut down in California, and fossils that have been looted at Carlsbad Caverns in my home State of New Mexico. We can’t let this kind of damage happen to our most treasured places, and we must ensure that small businesses that depend on our public lands—from fishing guides to gas stations and hotels—are able to thrive and keep our economy strong.

Across the board, this shutdown is hurting businesses, contractors, and Federal workers. Even the President’s own Council of Economic Advisers has released figures doubling the expected impacts to the economy. Think about that. The President’s own aides admit this shutdown is worse than they anticipated. This is totally unacceptable, but it is not too late to change the situation.

We can end this shutdown today. All it takes is for enough of my Republican colleagues and friends to find the courage to join us to pass these appropriations bills and to send a message to the White House that we need to reopen the government. I want to say to them, let’s join together to make sure that Tribal health clinics are open and Tribal law enforcement officers are on the job.

Let’s work side by side to reopen the entire National Park System and other public lands and ensure that there are enough staff members on the ground to protect our Nation’s most cherished national and cultural resources. Let’s pass these bipartisan appropriations bills without delay.

I don’t understand how this Chamber can stand by and watch the devastating effects of this shutdown on our Nation. In New Mexico alone, we estimate that there are at least 10,800 Federal workers who are working without pay or are furloughed outright. Nation-wide, there are an estimated 800,000 Federal workers and an estimated 8 million Federal contractors who may be affected. We are talking about millions of people’s paychecks being held hostage for a border wall that the American public doesn’t want.

Yesterday I stood on this floor and talked about the impacts this shutdown is having on the Ornelas family of Carlsbad, NM. They are depending on a paycheck from the Department of Interior to help keep their family afloat as they deal with a disabled son who had two brain surgeries. The Ornelas family was already dealing with one of the worst crises a family can go through, and now they have to worry about how to pay for basic necessities. They are just one example of the lives at stake.

It is not just Federal workers and Federal contractors. Every single American relies on the Federal Government for essential public safety and security. The Food and Drug Administration shut down—contaminated food can kill thousands. TSA agents and FAA air traffic controllers we rely on to keep our traffic safe are unpaid. In a massive irony, President Trump’s shutdown means the Department of Homeland Security is unpaid. There are an estimated 2,000 New Mexicans we rely on for border security, international trade, and immigration work who are unpaid. This really truly is madness. For their sake and for the sake of all Americans who are affected by this tragic situation, we need to end this shutdown now. The consequences of inaction are too great.

Once again, let me thank Senator Kaine for his passion on this issue, for his vigilance in terms of bringing this issue, and fighting with all of us on the floor.

I yield to Senator Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. I will briefly conclude my comments recognizing my colleagues from Indiana is also on the floor.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his words. He spoke about the
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motion I just made. I will be on the floor tomorrow and Saturday and next week—Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday—to share stories that have been shared with me and are being shared with me every day by Virginians affected by and the Agencies the Senator from New Mexico discussed and others.

Just to clarify, the motion that I made earlier was to pass a House bill that is pending before us. It is an appropriation for the remainder of the fiscal year for the following Departments and Agencies: Department of Interior; Environmental Protection Agency; Forest Service; Department of Treasury, including the IRS; Judiciary; Executive Office of the President—we are trying to fund the Executive Office of the President; the District of Columbia; Department of Agriculture, including the Food Stamp Program; the Food and Drug Administration; Department of Transportation; Department of Housing and Urban Development; Department of Commerce; Department of Justice, including the FBI; science-related Agencies, including NASA; the Department of State and several related and independent Agencies.

That was the motion that I made that was objected to by the majority leader.

Three items quickly. There are three levels of surreal illogic to the position we are in. The first is, we are having a legitimate debate between Congress and the President on border security and immigration reform. That is a very legitimate debate, in which there are intellectually respectable differences of opinion. If we are having a debate about that, why would we punish the workers who are charged with administering the Food Stamp Program? Why punish workers in the National Forest and National Parks? Why punish the citizens who need those services? The first level of illogic to the position we are in is we are punishing both workers and the citizens who need services completely unconnected with the border and immigration reform issue.

Surreal illogic No. 2. If we are having a debate about safety and security on the border, why would we demand Customs and Border Patrol folks work without pay? Those who are affected and who are part of the Agencies dealing with the dispute are, by all accounts, people on the front lines dealing with this—immigration judges, Custom and Border Patrol folks, ICE agents, DEA agents, the Coast Guard, which interdicts drugs, FBI, U.S. marshals, BATF agents—why would we make their lives harder when they are the safety and security professionals who are charged with dealing with the issue we are trying to figure out?

The final level of surreal illogic, as I yield to my colleague from Indiana, is this. I want to thank all my colleagues because a week ago, by unanimous consent, we passed a backpay bill that the President signed yesterday. Now we have guaranteed that the Federal Treasury will write a check for the paychecks for all of these workers. It is actually probably going to be more because to close and restart actually costs a little bit more. We agreed to pay backpay in this and any future shutdowns. So if we are going to pay them anyway, why wouldn’t we want them to be serving Americans instead of being furloughed? If we are going to pay them anyway—if the Federal Treasury is going to do it, wouldn’t it be better if they are in their offices answering phones, processing food stamp applications, and serving their fellow Americans than locked out of their offices?

We bar Federal workers from striking because of the need for continuous government operations, but we are locking them out of their offices while we have agreed to give them full pay—point of view the fact I would have been doing had we not locked them out. That is not fiscally smart.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that is very important to my constituents in my State of Indiana. It is also an issue that is very close to my heart—the sanctity of life. Tomorrow, thousands of pro-life advocates from around the country, including many Hoosiers, will convene in Washington for the March for Life. This is the world’s largest annual pro-life demonstration.

You may not be able to tell this by watching today’s television or movies, but there is bipartisan agreement among most Americans that we must protect human life. This is no old-fashioned pro-life movement—those who have dedicated their lives to saving innocent children. These and other Hoosiers, of course, elected me to represent their interests in the Senate, but they also elected me to represent their values. I have been proud to work on legislation that reflects those values.

Already in this new Congress, I have joined dozens of my Senate colleagues on a letter to President Trump asking for a public commitment to only support pro-life legislative and administrative policies. This is not something new. The President has indeed been supportive of pro-life policies, but House Democrats have already indicated they intend to move forward with pro-abortion legislation this Congress. We would like the President to let the House know that he is going to veto any kind of legislation that doesn’t respect the sanctity of life.

I have also joined several of my colleagues this week to sponsor the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act of 2019, which we just voted on. This bill would have established a government-wide statutory prohibition on taxpayer subsidies for abortion or abortion coverage. Federal taxpayer dollars should absolutely not be used to fund abortion.

I am incredibly disappointed that my colleagues didn’t join me in voting to pass this important legislation today. I will continue looking for ways to advance this needed reform.

I am also a cosponsor of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which ensures that a baby who survives an abortion will receive the same treatment as any child naturally born premature at the very same age. We must do all we can to protect innocent life.

Before being elected to the Senate, I sat on the board of directors of the Hannah House in Bloomington, IN. This is a maternity home that offers women loving support during their pregnancy. I also spent 2 years as a smalltown attorney in Southern Indiana. During that time, I offered free legal services to parents who wanted to adopt. I am passionate about helping children find loving forever homes and helping caring adults become parents. I have come to appreciate firsthand, through my own life experiences, the value of children and those who cannot advocate for themselves.

We are divided on so many issues today, but protecting the lives of unborn children should not be one of those issues. I will continue working on legislation that advances pro-life values, and I am hopeful we can soon turn these actions into law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerks will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, folks from all over the country—ages, all backgrounds, and all walks of life—come together to celebrate and highlight one of the single most important priorities of this Nation, and that is protecting the unborn.

In fact, tomorrow, nearly 100,000 of these folks will march right here in Washington, DC, at the March for Life rally. I will be speaking at that rally tomorrow.

As American citizens, I believe in our founding principle that all men and all women are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Every human life must be valued. Every human life must be protected from conception until
death. We must stand to protect the most vulnerable in our society, and that includes the unborn.

I am grateful that under President Trump’s leadership and the Republican-led U.S. Senate, we have delivered some of the strongest pro-life results in history. In fact, in the last Congress, this Republican-led Senate confirmed 85 conservative judges. That includes a record-setting 30 circuit court judges. We also confirmed 53 district court judges and two new Supreme Court Justices.

I remember when I left the private sector to come to public service that when the Senate put a judge on the bench, that meant these were lifetime appointments. We can pass laws here. Laws can be changed in the current Congress. Laws can be changed in a future Congress. But these judges are lifetime appointments.

Despite the great progress we have made over the last couple of years, there is plenty of work to be done. In fact, just this week, I was grateful and thankful to see 48 of my Senate colleagues join me in sending a letter to President Trump urging him to sign any legislation—any legislation—that is coming out of the House that would erode pro-life protections.

The good news is, this is a battle we are winning, and this is a battle we must absolutely win.

Thank you.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, a couple of days ago I came to the floor to talk about the partial government shutdown, how it is impacting different parts of my State—the Great State of Alaska—and, in particular, how it is impacting the men and women in the U.S. Coast Guard.

I think we all recognize as we are trying to work through this partial government shutdown, that a lot of Federal workers are being impacted, but let me talk about the Coast Guard because I think it is a little different than almost any other group of Federal workers.

On Tuesday, these brave men and women did not receive a paycheck. They didn’t receive a paycheck, and they are the only branch of the U.S. military right now, out there around the world and around the globe, risking their lives for the American people, who are not getting paid. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—we love them all. They are working hard. They are getting paid. The men and women of the Coast Guard are not getting paid. That is not just for the American people, who are not getting paid, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—we love them all. They are working hard. They are getting paid. The men and women of the Coast Guard are not getting paid. That is not just for the American people, who are not getting paid, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—we love them all. They are working hard. They are getting paid. The men and women of the Coast Guard are not getting paid. They would get court-martialed. They are working hard, saving lives in my State, certainly—in Alaska—all the time, and they are not getting paid. So when the other services are getting paid.

So what did we do? A number of us, Democrats and Republicans—almost one-quarter of the Members of the U.S. Senate—cosponsored a bill that says: Let’s pay the Coast Guard. Let’s pay the Coast Guard right now so they are treated fairly, like the other men and women serving in our military.

The Coast Guard works off the books optimistically. It has been a bit of a roller coaster ride, but, to be honest, I couldn’t imagine that this bill wouldn’t sail through. We are not going to be able to fix everything right now, but this is one we can start working on, on these individual issues, and there is a lot of talk of doing it.

Last week, I had the opportunity to raise this with the President and his administration and the Secretary of Homeland Security, and we continued to press this issue all week with the OMB Director, the Chief of Staff of the White House, and the President himself, and he said this week that he was going to support the bill. That is important.

Now you have the executive branch, the White House, and he will sign it. He said it. I was in a meeting with him yesterday, and he said he is 100 percent supportive of this bill. It is bipartisan. There are actually more Democrats than Republicans on the right about this.

What we did, trying to move this quickly, is we said: All right, the President is going to sign it. We have a quarter of the Senate. It is a bipartisan bill. Let’s move it.

We move to file it. What does that mean? To try to get this bill to be moved through unanimous consent through the Senate, a hotline means you are going to try to move it real fast and everybody is going to vote on it. That started today. By noon, every Republican Member of the U.S. Senate said: Good to go—cleared, hot. Let’s pay the men and women of the Coast Guard.

I had the opportunity to talk to a local public radio program in Kodiak, the largest Coast Guard station in the country. I had the opportunity to say to my fellow Alaskans that I am pretty optimistic. We have moved. We have a lot of cosponsors—25 percent of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans—and the President of the United States. Bingo, Republicans have said we are good to go on it. I have certainly started working with some of my Democratic colleagues who are also optimistic. Why would we block this? Remember, they are the only men and women in the U.S. military not getting paid right now, and we have a solution.

So I come to the floor, and I hate to admit it because 2 hours ago I was pretty optimistic, but I am getting word that my colleagues—the Democrats and the minority leader—are now saying: Maybe we are just going to block this. I am not sure why. Nobody has come down here to say why. We are running out of time. It is a Democratic side. So maybe that is just a rumor. I hope it is just a rumor. Why would you block it? Come on, my colleagues on the other side. Why would you block it? We are not going to fix everything tonight, but we could fix this tonight.

Let me talk a little bit about my State. Some of you have probably seen the “Deadliest Catch” and those kind of things. We have the most rugged Coast Guard. They are working hard, saving lives in the State of Alaska—all the time, and they are not out there keeping our fishermen—American fishermen—safe. On average, every month in the State of Alaska the Coast Guard saves 22 lives—in 1 month, on average, in one State—and it assists 53 people, responds and investigates 25 maritime casualties, conducts close to 20 security boardings and over 20 security patrols. If you are in trouble on the high seas in Alaska, which is a bad place to be, the seas are never too rough or the skies never too dismal for the Coast Guard to come out and rescue you. We have seen it time and again, but it is not just in Alaska. It is all over the country, and it is all over the world.

I talked to the Commandant of the Coast Guard just yesterday. Mr. Commandant, Admiral, I think we are close. The President is good to go. I think most of the Senators are good to go. The bill has 25 cosponsors.

He reminded me that he has men and women in the Coast Guard deployed in the Persian Gulf doing anti-piracy operations alongside U.S. Marines and U.S. Navy personnel—right now, in the Persian Gulf, Marines, Coast Guard, and Navy—and guess who is not getting paid. Does anyone think that should be a tolerated situation? The answer is no. The answer is no.

Again, I hope this is a rumor, and that the hotline is happening right now on the Democratic side. We have cleared it—good to go. Every Republican has signed off on this. I hope that this is just a rumor—that tonight the Democrats will clear this and we will get it to the House. The Coast Guard said they can start cutting checks again within 24 hours. The President will sign this. So there should be no reason not to do this.

The partial government shutdown is negatively impacting Federal workers. The President’s request, in my view, for border security is imminently reasonable. I hope the Speaker will view it that way. A lot of her members are. We are all working for this. We are all working for a solution. Senator Johnson put out a bill that I joined as a cosponsor that would immediately pay all Federal employees who are working without pay. This would expand the idea of what we are doing with the Coast Guard bill. I think it is a good idea. That is a start, but the Coast Guard bill right now has momentum. It has momentum.

We could get this done in 24 hours. It is not a complete solution, but we have the White House, and it should be the Senate and, hopefully, the House getting ready to find a solution for at least for some of the men and women in the Federal workforce.

But as I like to emphasize, they are not just any Federal workers. All of
them are important—there is no doubt—but when you are the only members of the military not getting paid for risking your lives for your country and we can fix it here tonight in the Senate, that is what we should be doing.

I certainly hope this bill isn’t being blocked unreasonably. As I mentioned, it is not a complete solution, but it is the start of a solution. For the life of me, I can’t understand why this bill would be blocked.

More importantly, the men and women of the Guard will not understand why this bill is being blocked. Communities that support and depend on the Guard—like Kodiak, AK—will not understand why this bill is being blocked. These young men and women, who love their country and have chosen to serve and protect us, are not going to understand why this bill is being blocked tonight.

I don’t want to use the word plead, but I am asking my colleagues on the Democratic side to do the right thing and pass this bill tonight. Every single American who is aware of this situation knows that it is inequitable when the other members of the military—who are out there risking their lives just like the men and women of the Guard—are getting paid and the men and women of the Guard aren’t.

We are on the verge of a solution. Passing this bill will take care of at least one issue that we are all trying to resolve. Again, I urge my Democratic colleagues—because all of my Republican colleagues have already passed this bill in the hotline. I urge my colleagues to take up this bill, do the right thing, and support the men and women of the Guard, who are not being treated equal to their brothers and sisters in the other branches of the military.

Until then, I am going to continue to fight for this. I am going to continue to raise the issue. We have made a lot of progress, including getting the White House and the President on board and getting all of our Members here on the Republican side of the Senate on board. I am hopeful, with more advocacy and more reasoning with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that we will also get there, move this to the House quickly, and get the men and women of the Guard the paychecks they are needing.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senator McConnell’s consent to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ZACHARY CRESS

Mr. THUNE, Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Lieutenant Commander Zachary Cress of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—Commissioned Officer Corps, who has served as a fellow on the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee for the past year.

I want to thank Lieutenant Commander Cress for his hard work from which the committee greatly benefited. His expertise as a ship driver and manager of our Nation’s marine resource—particularly NOAA’s research—has meaningfully informed the committee’s efforts. He has worked on several pieces of legislation that have become law, including the National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2018. His contributions have enabled NOAA to carry out its missions more effectively.

Again, I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lieutenant Commander Cress for all of the fine work he has done and for his continued service to our nation. I wish him success in the years to come.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 190. An act to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 251. An act to extend by 15 months the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 190. An act to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-138. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Anthony R. Ierardi, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-139. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments” (RIN3170-AA62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-140. A communication from the Program Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “OCC Guidelines Establishing Standard Recovery Planning by Certain Large Insured National Banks, Insured Federal Savings Associations, and Insured Federal Branches; Technical Amendments” (RIN1557-AE51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.
and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HINICH, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat rates of tax on estates, generation-skipping transfers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. CARDEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CAFERO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. Risch, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 176. A bill to require Senate confirmation of nominees to the Court of International Trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLMUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 176. A bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. ERNST):

S. 177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on estates, generation-skipping transfers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. CARDEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CAFERO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. Risch, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BERNSTEIN, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain financial assistance under the State energy program and the Weatherization Assistance Program to be distributed without undue delay to support State and local high-impact energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, and Mr. REED):

S. 183. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearm violence, gun violence, firearm violence prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, and Mr. REED):

S. 183. A bill to require certain financial assistance under the State energy program and the Weatherization Assistance Program to be distributed without undue delay to support State and local high-impact energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. Cramer, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORKY, Mr. SASS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. Risch, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. BLACKBURN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 20. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Protecting Life Amendment to the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2020, and any other similar legislation, should be permanently established; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 21. A resolution to constitute the minority party’s membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixtieth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 22. A resolution condemning the terrorist attack in Nairobi, Kenya on January 15, 2019, and offering sincere condolences to all of the victims, their families and friends, and the people of Kenya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. MURRAY, S. Res. 4. A joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate as a condition of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. RUBIO.

S. Res. 23. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. Tester).

S. Res. 24. A resolution supporting a robust and modern ICBM force to maximize the value of the nuclear triad of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 21, a bill making continuing appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations act expires prior to the enactment of a new appropriations act.

S. 74

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes.

S. 75

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 75, a bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 131

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit Federal Medicaid funding for the administration of contraceptive methods; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

S. 139

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to impose equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 140

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

S. 162

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SHERMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. HAYACK) were added as cosponsors of S. 162, a bill to provide back pay to low-wage contractor employees, and for other purposes.

S. 165

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 165, a bill to amend chapter 65 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify that employers excepted from a furlough are eligible for unemployment compensation.

S. CON. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 1, a concurrent resolution calling for credible, transparent, and safe elections in Nigeria, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 10, a resolution honoring the life of Richard Arvin Overton.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 175. A bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that would shield farmworkers from deportation and put them on a path to earned legal status and eventual citizenship.

By protecting farmworkers from deportation, this bill advances two goals: ensuring that hardworking immigrants don’t live in fear and that California’s agriculture industry has the workforce it needs to survive.

Under the Agricultural Worker Program Act, farmworkers who have worked in agriculture for at least 100 days in each of the past 2 years may earn lawful “blue card” status. Farmworkers who maintain blue card status for the next 3 or 5 years, depending on the total hours worked in agriculture, would be eligible to adjust to a green card or legal permanent residency. This would provide them with a path to citizenship.

Everywhere I travel in California, I hear from farmers, growers and producers from all industries—wine, citrus, fruit and tree nuts, dairy—that there aren’t enough workers. Farm labor is performed almost exclusively by immigrants—fact that should surprise no one. In fact, over 90 percent of California’s crop workers are immigrants, and half are unauthorized.

Despite their significant contributions to California’s economy and communities, farmworkers are now a priority for deportation under this administration’s shameful policies. We simply must protect the families who help put food on our tables by finding a path to citizenship for these workers and their families, the Agricultural Worker Program Act will preserve our agricultural system. This bill will also protect vulnerable workers who should not have to live in fear of becoming easy enforcement targets.

It is time to get started on solutions for agricultural communities across the country. Law-abiding workers should not have to fear deportation, but should have a path to citizenship that recognizes their enormous contribution to American prosperity and society. Employers should not have to fear that their labor force will be unable to return to work as a result of deportation. The Agricultural Worker Program Act provides dignity and stability for our farmworkers that is necessary to keep the industry strong. I would like to thank Representative LOFGREN in the House for working with me to introduce this legislation today in both chambers. I invite my colleagues in the Senate to co-sponsoring the bill and preventing the deportation of those who work so hard to put food on our tables.
The legislation I am introducing today along with Senators Gardner, Reed, Graham, Coons, Rubio, Blumenthal, and Collins, is a bipartisan message to the President and the necessary tool needed to block this US president from unilaterally terminating the NATO treaty. It is the position of the Senate, supported by this Resolution, and previous resolutions, including the original vote of 82-13 in 1949 to give the Senate’s advice and consent to join NATO, that the United States and the 30 other NATO-nations establishes that preventing a President from withdrawing the United States from NATO treaties requires the advice and consent of the Senate.

I am proud to have bipartisan support for this bill to ensure that the safety of the American people is prioritized through our continued membership in NATO. Lastly, supporting this bill would fittingly honor the late Senator John McCain, one of the fiercest advocates for NATO, who co-sponsored this bill last year—one of the last bills he co-sponsored. I strongly encourage my colleagues in both the Senate and the House of Representatives to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT NO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUND MIGHT BE USED TO PAY FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ABORTION AS A METHOD OF FAMILY PLANNING OR TO MOTIVATE OR COERCE ANY PERSON TO ABORTION; AND REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO Certify to the Appropriating Committees that none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to abortion.

RESOLVED, That the following shall constitute the minority party’s membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. Manchin, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Cortez Masto.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22—CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACK IN NAIROBI, KENYA ON JANUARY 15, 2019, AND OFFERING SYMPATHY AND CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS, THEIR FRIENDS, AND THE PEOPLE OF KENYA

Whereas, on January 15, 2019, attackers launched a 19-hour siege on the 14 Riverside complex and Dusit D2 hotel complex in Nairobi, Kenya, opening fire and detonating suicide bombs; and Whereas at least 21 people were killed, and many others were injured or remain unaccounted for; and Whereas, among those killed was Jason Spindler, a United States citizen; and Whereas the Somalia-based extremist group al-Shabaab claimed responsibility for the attack; and Whereas the United States has a deep and abiding interest in the security and stability of Kenya, a key partner to the United States in the war on terror; and Whereas respect for human rights, due process, and the rule of law is essential to

The legislation I am introducing today along with Senators Gardner, Reed, Graham, Coons, Rubio, Blumenthal, and Collins, is a bipartisan message to the President and the necessary tool needed to block this US president from unilaterally terminating the NATO treaty. It is the position of the Senate, supported by this Resolution, and previous resolutions, including the original vote of 82-13 in 1949 to give the Senate’s advice and consent to join NATO, that the United States and the 30 other NATO-nations establishes that preventing a President from withdrawing the United States from NATO treaties requires the advice and consent of the Senate.

I am proud to have bipartisan support for this bill to ensure that the safety of the American people is prioritized through our continued membership in NATO. Lastly, supporting this bill would fittingly honor the late Senator John McCain, one of the fiercest advocates for NATO, who co-sponsored this bill last year—one of the last bills he co-sponsored. I strongly encourage my colleagues in both the Senate and the House of Representatives to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT NO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUND MIGHT BE USED TO PAY FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ABORTION AS A METHOD OF FAMILY PLANNING OR TO MOTIVATE OR COERCE ANY PERSON TO ABORTION; AND REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO Certify to the Appropriating Committees that none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to abortion.

RESOLVED, That the following shall constitute the minority party’s membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. Manchin, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Cortez Masto.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22—CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACK IN NAIROBI, KENYA ON JANUARY 15, 2019, AND OFFERING SYMPATHY AND CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS, THEIR FRIENDS, AND THE PEOPLE OF KENYA

Whereas, on January 15, 2019, attackers launched a 19-hour siege on the 14 Riverside complex and Dusit D2 hotel complex in Nairobi, Kenya, opening fire and detonating suicide bombs; and Whereas at least 21 people were killed, and many others were injured or remain unaccounted for; and Whereas, among those killed was Jason Spindler, a United States citizen; and Whereas the Somalia-based extremist group al-Shabaab claimed responsibility for the attack; and Whereas the United States has a deep and abiding interest in the security and stability of Kenya, a key partner to the United States in the war on terror; and Whereas respect for human rights, due process, and the rule of law is essential to

The legislation I am introducing today along with Senators Gardner, Reed, Graham, Coons, Rubio, Blumenthal, and Collins, is a bipartisan message to the President and the necessary tool needed to block this US president from unilaterally terminating the NATO treaty. It is the position of the Senate, supported by this Resolution, and previous resolutions, including the original vote of 82-13 in 1949 to give the Senate’s advice and consent to join NATO, that the United States and the 30 other NATO-nations establishes that preventing a President from withdrawing the United States from NATO treaties requires the advice and consent of the Senate.

I am proud to have bipartisan support for this bill to ensure that the safety of the American people is prioritized through our continued membership in NATO. Lastly, supporting this bill would fittingly honor the late Senator John McCain, one of the fiercest advocates for NATO, who co-sponsored this bill last year—one of the last bills he co-sponsored. I strongly encourage my colleagues in both the Senate and the House of Representatives to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT NO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUND MIGHT BE USED TO PAY FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ABORTION AS A METHOD OF FAMILY PLANNING OR TO MOTIVATE OR COERCE ANY PERSON TO ABORTION; AND REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO Certify to the Appropriating Committees that none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to abortion.

RESOLVED, That the following shall constitute the minority party’s membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. Manchin, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Cortez Masto.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22—CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACK IN NAIROBI, KENYA ON JANUARY 15, 2019, AND OFFERING SYMPATHY AND CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILIES OF THE VICTIMS, THEIR FRIENDS, AND THE PEOPLE OF KENYA

Whereas, on January 15, 2019, attackers launched a 19-hour siege on the 14 Riverside complex and Dusit D2 hotel complex in Nairobi, Kenya, opening fire and detonating suicide bombs; and Whereas at least 21 people were killed, and many others were injured or remain unaccounted for; and Whereas, among those killed was Jason Spindler, a United States citizen; and Whereas the Somalia-based extremist group al-Shabaab claimed responsibility for the attack; and Whereas the United States has a deep and abiding interest in the security and stability of Kenya, a key partner to the United States in the war on terror; and Whereas respect for human rights, due process, and the rule of law is essential to
the success of any counterterrorism strategy. Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) condemns the horrific attack on the 14 Riverside for all participating D2 hotel complex in Nairobi, Kenya;
(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the victims of this attack and their families and friends;
(3) wishes a quick recovery to all who were injured;
(4) expresses solidarity with the people of Kenya;
(5) stands with the Government of Kenya as it works to combat violent extremism;
(6) urges the United States Government to take all necessary actions to help the Government of Kenya investigate the attack and swiftly bring the perpetrators of this attack to justice;
(7) calls upon the United States Government and international partners to continue to support efforts to improve Kenya’s crisis response management, and to train and equip Kenyan security forces to respond to violent extremism; and
(8) upholds its commitment to fight and defeat terrorism.

SENATE RESOLUTION 23—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF COUNTERING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL ABDUCTION AS PART OF EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE AWARENESS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL ABDUCTION

Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CRIPO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas thousands of children in the United States have been abducted from the United States by parents, separating those children from their parents who remain in the United States;

Whereas it is illegal under section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, to remove, or attempt to remove, a child from the United States or retain a child (who has been in the United States) outside of the United States; and

Whereas the United States has a history of promoting child welfare through institutions including—

(1) in the Department of Health and Human Services, the Children’s Bureau of the Administration for Children and Families;
(2) in the Department of State, the Office of Children’s Issues of the Bureau of Consular Affairs;


Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 543, 112th Congress, on December 4, 2012, which—

(1) condemns international parental child abduction;
(2) urges countries identified by the Department of State as noncompliant with the Hague Convention on Abduction to fulfill the commitment those countries made to implement such treaty; and
(3) expresses the sense of the Senate that the United States should—

(A) pursue the return, by all appropriate means, of each child abducted by a parent to another country;
(B) if a child is abducted by a parent and not returned to the United States, facilitate access to the abducted child for the parents, including notifying the United States; and
(C) “where appropriate, seek the extradition of the parent that abducted the child”

Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 431, 115th Congress, on April 19, 2018, which—

(1) raises awareness and promotes education about international parental child abduction;
(2) recognizes the impacts on children who are victims of international parental abductions; and
(3) expresses the sense of the Senate that the United States should—

(A) raise awareness and opposition on international parental child abduction;
(B) facilitate access to the abducted child for the parent remaining in the United States; and
(C) urge countries to comply with the requirement to bring children home to the United States;

Whereas all 50 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws criminalizing parental kidnapping;

Whereas, in 2017, the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State, enrolled more than 3,500 inquiries from the general public relating to preventing a child from being removed from the United States; and

(2) enrolled more than 4,404 children in the Children’s Passport Issuance Alert Program, which—

(1) is one of the most important tools of the Department of State for preventing international parental child abductions; and
(2) allows the Office of Children’s Issues to contact the enrolling parent or legal guardian to verify whether the parental consent requirement has been met when a passport application has been submitted for an enrolled child.

Whereas, the Department of State cannot track the ultimate destination of a child through the use of the passport of the child issued by the Department of State if the child is transported to a third country after departing from the United States;

Whereas a child who is a citizen of the United States may have another nationality and may travel using a passport issued by another country, which—

(1) increases the difficulty in determining the whereabouts of the child; and
(2) makes efforts to prevent abductions more critical; and

Whereas, in 2017, the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State, enrolled 210 children in a program aimed at preventing international parental child abduction;

Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes and observes “Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month” during the 2019-2020 school year;
(2) urges countries to continue playing a leadership role in raising awareness about the devastating impacts of international parental child abduction by educating the public about the negative emotional, psychological, and physical consequences to children and parents victimized by international parental child abduction.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24—SUPPORTING A ROBUST AND MODERN ICBM FORCE TO MAXIMIZE THE VALUE OF THE NUCLEAR TRIAD OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (in this preamble referred to as “ICBMs”) have been a critical part of the strategic deterrent of the United States for 6 decades in conjunction with air and sea-based strategic delivery systems;
Whereas President John F. Kennedy referred to the deployment of the first Minuteman missile during the Cuban Missile Crisis as his “ace in the hole”;

Whereas the Minuteman III missile entered service in 1970 and is still deployed in 2019, well beyond its originally intended service life;

Whereas the ICBM force of the United States peaked at more than 1,200 deployed missiles during the Cold War;

Whereas the ICBM force of the United States consists of approximately 400 Minuteman III missiles deployed across 450 operational missile silos, each carrying a single warhead;

Whereas the People's Republic of China currently deploys at least 300 ICBMs with multiple warheads loaded on each missile and has announced plans to replace its Soviet-era systems with modernized ICBMs;

Whereas the Russian Federation currently deploys at least 75 ICBMs and plans to grow its ICBM force through the deployment of modernized, road-mobile ICBMs that carry multiple warheads;

Whereas the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China deploy nuclear weapons across a variety of platforms in addition to their ICBM force;

Whereas numerous countries possess or are seeking to develop nuclear weapons capabilities that pose challenges to the nuclear deterrence of the United States;

Whereas the nuclear deterrent of the United States is comprised of a triad of delivery systems for nuclear weapons, including submarine-launched ballistic missiles (in this preamble referred to as “SLBMs”), air-delivered gravity bombs and cruise missiles, and land-based ballistic missiles that provide interlocking and mutually reinforcing attributes that enhance strategic deterrence;

Whereas weakening one leg of the triad limits the deterrence value of the other legs of the triad;

Whereas, in the nuclear deterrent of the United States, ICBMs provide commanders with the most prompt response capability, SLBMs provide stealth and survivability, and aircraft armed with nuclear weapons provide flexibility;

Whereas the ICBM force of the United States forces any would-be attacker to confront more than 400 discrete targets, thus creating an effectively insurmountable target with which to worry potential adversaries;

Whereas the size, dispersal, and global reach of the ICBM force of the United States ensures that no adversary can escalate a crisis beyond the ability of the United States to respond;

Whereas a potential attacker would be forced to expend far more warheads to destroy the ICBM forces of the United States than the United States would lose in an attack, because of the deployment of a single warhead on each ICBM of the United States;

Whereas the ICBM force provides a persistent deterrent capability that reinforces strategic stability;

Whereas ICBMs are the cheapest delivery system for nuclear weapons for the United States to operate and maintain;

Whereas United States Strategic Command has validated military requirements for the unique capabilities of ICBMs;

Whereas, in a 2014 analysis of alternatives, the Air Force concluded that replacing the Minuteman III missile would provide upgraded performance at a lower cost when compared with extending the service life of the Minuteman III missile; and

Whereas the Minuteman III replacement program provides a ground-based strategic deterrent capability for 5 decades after the program enters service; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (in this resolution referred to as “ICBMs”) have certain characteristics, including responsiveness, persistence, and dispersal, that enhance strategic stability and magnify the deterrent value of the air and sea-based legs of the nuclear triad of the United States;

(2) emphasizes the role that ICBMs have played and continue to play in deterring attacks on the United States and its allies;

(3) observes that while arms control agreements have reduced the size of the ICBM force of the United States, adversaries of the United States continue to enhance, enlarge, and modernize their ICBM forces;

(4) supports the modernization of the ICBM force of the United States through the ground-based strategic deterrent program;

(5) highlights that ICBMs have the lowest operation, maintenance, and modernization costs of any part of the nuclear deterrent of the United States; and

(6) opposes efforts to unilaterally reduce the size of the ICBM force of the United States during the implementation of the ground-based strategic deterrent program, which would degrade the deterrent capabilities of a fully operational and modernized nuclear triad.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jason Smith and Alison Grabr, fellows at the Senate Commerce Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 116th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDIACIA EXTENDERS ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 259, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 259) to extend the Medicaid Money Follows the Person Rebalancing demonstration, to extend protection for Medicare recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, and for other purposes

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 259) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD ARVIN OVERTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 10) honoring the life of Richard Arvin Overton.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution (with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 8, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

CONSTITUTING THE MINORITY PARTY’S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 21, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 21) to constitute the minority party’s membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 21) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the
Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Friday, January 18; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:32 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 18, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD
THOMAS A. SUMMERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2020, VICE SEAN SULLIVAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
MARK LEE GREENBLATT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, VICE EARL E. DEVANEY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
DONALD W. WASHINGTON, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE, VICE STACIA A. HYLTON.

THE JUDICIARY
GREG GIRARD GUIDRY, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE KURT D. ENGLEHARDT, ELEVATED. JAMES WESLEY HENDRICK, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE SAM R. CUMMINGS, RETIRED. SEAN D. JORDAN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE RICHARD A. SCHELL, RETIRED. MICHAEL T. LIBURDI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE DAVID G. CAMPBELL, RETIRED. MARK T. FITTMAN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE JOHN R. MCBRYDE, RETIRED. PETER D. WELTE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA, VICE RALPH R. ERICKSON, ELEVATED.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHYLLIS WEBSTER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize Phyllis Womack Webster on the occasion of her 90th birthday.

A lifelong resident of St. Albans, West Virginia, Phyllis is known for her joyful approach to life and compassionate and kind nature. A member of St. Albans Baptist Church for more than half a century, Phyllis has impacted many lives for the better through her ministry with her church and the American Baptist Association. She was recognized in 2010 for her dedicated involvement in her church with the American Heritage Award.

Her outreach to people extended beyond her church family. Her door has always been open to host family, friends or anyone in need of a good listening ear or warm meal. Thanks to her hospitable nature, I would not be surprised if, as Scripture says, she hosted Angels unaware.

She can, and has made everyone and anyone feel special. Her love for family and people and sharp mind, she can remember the names of every family member through multiple generations. Phyllis’ life, efforts and love for others are an example for us all of a life well-lived serving others.

It is my pleasure to recognize my beloved Aunt Phyllis on this momentous occasion. I wish her a very happy 90th birthday and may God continue to bless her.

HON. JIMMY PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Santa Cruz County Superintendent of Schools, Michael Watkins, on his retirement after serving the Santa Cruz County Office of Education since 1980. Mr. Watkins was the first African American elected as a School Superintendent in the State of California in 2006. An outstanding citizen and educator, Superintendent Watkins made an unparalleled impact in the educational community of Santa Cruz County through 35 years of service.

Superintendent Watkins began his career with the Santa Cruz County Office of as the Learning Handicapped Program Specialist, a position which set the tone for Superintendent Watkins’ career as a visionary advocate for change and accessibility in education. After one year, he was offered the role of General Administrator in charge of the Special Education Programs for Santa Cruz County, where he worked to mainstream educational opportunities for students with special needs across the district. In addition, Superintendent Watkins pioneered and developed community and vocational programming through his role as Director of Alternative Education. Under Superintendent Watkins’ leadership, the schools he developed have received acclaim and statewide recognition for their commitment to excellence. With the backing of his tremendous record as an educator, Michael Watkins was elected Santa Cruz County Superintendent of Schools in 2006 and is currently serving his third term.

Superintendent Watkins’ expertise in education also led to his appointment by the California Senate Rules Committee to the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence and the Special Education Task Force. He has also held statewide office as President of the Juvenile Courts, Community, and Alternative School Administrators of California for three years. In addition to his service in education, Superintendent Watkins has been an exemplary citizen and community leader. He has coached multiple youth sports and sits on several significant local boards.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the dedication and work of Superintendent Watkins. I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Superintendent Watkins and to congratulate him on his well-earned retirement. I extend my ear

HON. GREG GIANFORTE OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Alicia Edwards of Eureka, a Montana artist, author, and World War II refugee, who overcame the atrocities of war and recorded her family’s journey as part of the historic diaspora of the Polish people.

When she was a teenager, Alicia’s small town in eastern Poland came under attack by Nazi Germany and suffered a brutal Soviet occupation. She and her family were forced into a Soviet gulag where they endured mistreatment, illness, and hunger. Three years later, Alicia and thousands of other Poles were exiled to Iran. It was there where she met American Army Lieutenant Ernest Edwards who she married in 1945. The couple raised two children, lived in Japan, France, and America, and were married for 50 years before Ernest’s passing. Alicia is renowned for her memoirs, and God Was Our Witness and They Called Us D.P.’s, that detailed the suffering of her family and hundreds of thousands of Poles displaced during and after World War II.

In And God Was Our Witness, she describes the value of freedom and liberty: “Priceless Freedom has never been perceived or truly understood by anyone, till it was lost or forcibly taken away. Only then, one becomes aware of the magnitude of its potency and power in directing one’s life and fate.”

Alicia is a noted artist and owns an antique and art shop in Eureka, where she continues to paint, play the piano, and inspire others. Madam Speaker, for her indomitable resolve, strength and courage, and her inspiring memoirs of the Polish diaspora, I recognize Alicia Edwards for her spirit of Montana.

IN RECOGNITION OF DENTON COUNTY COMMISSIONER BOBBIE MITCHELL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Denton County Commissioner Bobbie Mitchell, who will receive the 2019 Dr. Bettye Myers Humanitarian Award on January 19, 2019 after more than 30 years of dedicated service to Denton County.

Commissioner Mitchell has served her fellow North Texans in a range of leadership roles since 1985, when she began her tenure on the Zoning Board of Adjustment. During the last three decades, she served on the Lewisville Planning and Zoning Commission, as Mayor Pro Tem, and on the Lewisville City Council. A resident of Lewisville since 1971, she led the city as its mayor from 1993 to 2000 before being elected as a Denton County Commissioner.

During her many years as a devoted public servant, Commissioner Mitchell undoubtedly has made Lewisville a better place to work and live. In addition to her official service, she has had a significant impact on more than 30 nonprofit organizations in our community.

A longtime supporter of the United Way of Denton County, Commissioner Mitchell was a charter appointee to the organization’s key initiatives: the Denton County Behavioral Health Leadership Team in 2016 and the Denton County Homelessness Leadership Team in 2017. She is the sixth recipient of the Dr. Bettye Myers Humanitarian Award, which was established by the board of directors and lifetime members of United Way of Denton County in 2014 to recognize outstanding community leadership, philanthropy, and impact.

On a personal note, I have had the good fortune of knowing Commissioner Mitchell since I began my medical practice in 1981. Throughout my medical career and my time in public service, whether solicited or not, she has never hesitated to provide wise counsel and guidance.

It is a privilege to recognize my friend, Commissioner Mitchell, for her dedication and commitment to her fellow North Texans, and I congratulate her on this well-earned honor.
RECOGNIZING LTC BRAD CARVER ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, on November 22, 2018, my friend William Bradley Carver retired from 28 years of service in U.S. Army Reserve. Today, I rise to pay tribute to Brad, a leader in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, and a man who embodies the spirit of public service.

Brad was born in Valdosta, Georgia, the only child to Billy and JoAnn Carver, whom he has made proud by his multitude of life accomplishments thus far. Brad graduated from high school as Salutatorian and was voted “Most Likely to Succeed” due to his many achievements, including serving as a high school surrogate speaker for President George H.W. Bush campaign. He continued his education at Duke University as an ROTC cadet, and graduated with Honors earning his Bachelor of Arts in Political Science. He later earned his M.B.A. and J.D. from the University of Georgia.

While attending law school, Brad took a hiatus to serve as a Lieutenant in the 341st A.G. Company in support of Operation Joint Endeavor and Operation Joint Guard, Tuzla, Bosnia. He was promoted to Captain in 2000 and served as Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel of the 355th Theater Signal Command at Camp Irwin, California, and Camp Buehring, Iraq in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Brad was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for Exceptionally Meritorious Service. Brad continued his service in the U.S. Army Reserve for an additional 15 years, elevating to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Brad has also been serving the public by impacting constructive public policy and in supporting his beloved Republican Party. Brad has been engaged in local, statewide, and national Republican campaigns for the past 24 years. He has served as an elected officer in the Buckhead Young Republicans, Atlanta Young Republicans, Fulton County Republican Party, 11th Congressional District Republican Committee, and on the board for the Georgia Republican Party Foundation. Brad has also held gubernatorial appointments on the Georgia Board of Corrections and as a Special Executive Counsel for the commission on water issues.

In 2006, Brad became a partner at the law offices of Huber, Booth, Smith, P.C., serving as a senior manager directing government affairs. He was chosen as a James Magazine Top 4 Rising Star (2010) and one of Georgia Trend Magazine Top 40 Under 40 (2011).

Brad married Michelle in 2007 and their two sons, William Bradley Carver, Jr. (7) and Wesley Thomas Carver (4), regularly attend political events with their parents.

On behalf of Georgia’s 11th Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I commend Brad for his service to his community, state and nation, and congratulate him upon his retirement from the U.S. Army Reserve. We are fortunate to have a man such as Brad Carver in Georgia’s 11th Congressional District.

IN HONOR OF MILBRA DOLORES WALTERS MATHIAS

HON. KEVIN BRADY OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor the life of an amazing member of our community, Milbra Dolores Walters Mathias, who passed away on January 3, 2019 in Conroe, Texas. Dolores lived a determined life. Prior to retiring in Montgomery, Texas, Dolores spent time in the banking industry and later ran a dry cleaning business with her husband in Houston, Texas. Beyond her professional endeavors, she also led a service-oriented life with the goal of improving the community around her. One of her greatest joys was the community she found at the Montgomery United Methodist Church, where Dolores was a longtime active member.

To those who knew Dolores, it comes as no surprise that she spent much of her retirement serving those in need. Dolores took genuine pleasure in being around people, and she found great satisfaction in helping others. She served in the Volunteer Auxiliary of Conroe Regional Hospital for several years and later as a Veterans Administration Volunteer at the Conroe VA Clinic. Here, Dolores dedicated over 9,500 volunteer hours to our veterans—a remarkable accomplishment, and one Dolores was extremely proud of. In recognition of her kindness, selflessness, and thoughtfulness, she was rewarded the President’s Lifetime Achievement Award. This prestigious award highlights those like Dolores who go above and beyond to give back to their community.

She is survived by her nieces, Patsy Jackson, Betty Vanya and Charlotte Henner; nephews, Harold Stegall; and great nieces, Lauren Jackson and Lynn Stegall; daughter-in-law, Joan Mathias; granddaughters, Nicole Parrenton and Renee Mathias; and great grandchildren, Cooper and Ava.

While we mourn the loss of this woman, we also celebrate Dolores’ life and her remarkable legacy of service. She was truly a joy to all who knew her. She will be greatly missed.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESsing CONGRESS’ SUPPORT FOR PROVIDING TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS TO HAITIAN NATIONALS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES AT THE TIME HURRICANE MATTHEW HIT HAITI

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, today I rise today in support of my House concurrent resolution, which expresses Congress’ support for extending Temporary Protected Status (TPS) to Haitian Nationals who resided in the United States when Hurricane Matthew hit Haiti on October 4, 2016.

Hurricane Matthew was the worst hurricane to hit the country in 50 years. It took the lives of over 1,000 people and directly affected 2.1 million Haitians with the displacement of 175,000 people and leaving 1.4 million in need of urgent humanitarian aid.

It is estimated that Hurricane Matthew resulted in damage that will cost Haiti $1,000,000,000, or about 11.4 percent of its gross domestic product, and includes extensive damage to Haiti’s roadways, bridges, buildings, and other critical infrastructure. Additionally, Hurricane Matthew resulted in tremendous destruction in Haiti’s agricultural sector with crop losses estimated to be $360 million.

Madam Speaker, as we all know, Haiti continues its efforts to rebuild from the 2010, 7.0 magnitude earthquake, and recover from the Cholera outbreak of the same year. With these tragedies in mind, and the knowledge that Haitians continue to work diligently to address these and other important issues, including creating strong democratic institutions, I encourage all Members to join me in letting the Haitian Diaspora know that we stand with them.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DAY 2019

HON. J. FRENCH HILL OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following Presidential Proclamation on Religious Freedom Day 2019.

OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY
[For Immediate Release—January 15, 2019]

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DAY, 2019

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
A PROCLAMATION

On Religious Freedom Day, we celebrate our Nation’s long-standing commitment to freedom of conscience and the freedom to profess one’s own faith. The right to religious freedom is innate to the dignity of every human person and is foundational to the pursuit of truth.

The Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth shared an experience common to many of America’s first settlers: they had fled their home countries to escape religious persecution. Aware of this history, our Nation’s Founding Fathers readily understood that a just government must respect the deep yearning for truth and openness to the transcendent that are part of the human spirit. For this reason, from the beginning, our constitutional republic has endeavored to protect a robust understanding of religious freedom. On January 16, 1786, Virginia enacted the Statute for Religious Freedom to protect the right of individual conscience and religious exercise and to prohibit the compulsory support of any church. Authored by Thomas Jefferson, the statute set forth the principle that religious liberty is an inherent right and not a gift of the state. Jefferson’s statute served as the inspiration and model for the legal architecture of the conscience
protections in the First Amendment, drafted by James Madison just a few years later.

Unfortunately, the fundamental human right to religious freedom is under attack. Efforts to diminish religious freedom or to separate it from adjoining civil liberties, like property rights or free speech—are on the rise. Over time, legislative and political attacks on religious freedom have given way to actual violence. Last October, we witnessed a horrific attack on the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania—the deadliest attack on the Jewish community in our Nation’s history. Tragically, attacks on people of faith and their houses of worship have increased in frequency in recent years.

My Administration is taking action to protect religious liberty and to seek justice against those who seek to abridge it. The Department of Justice is aggressively prosecuting those who use violence or threats to interfere with the religious freedom of their fellow Americans. In January of 2018, the Justice Department announced a religious liberty update to the Justice Manual, raising the profile of religious liberty cases. Also in January of 2018, the Department of Health and Human Services undertook major policy changes to protect religious freedom, including forming a new Conscience and Religious Freedom Division within the Department’s Office for Civil Rights and proposing a comprehensive new conscience protection regulation to reinvigorate enforcement of religious freedom laws within existing health care programs.

Around the globe today, people are being persecuted for their faith by authoritarian dictatorships, terrorist groups, and other intolerant individuals. To address this tragic reality, last July, at my request, the Secretary of State convened the first-ever Ministerial to Advance Religious Freedom. We are listening to the voices of those risking their lives for their religious beliefs, and we are listening to the families of people who have died fighting for their fundamental right of conscience.

Our Nation was founded on the premise that a just government abides by the “Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.” As the Founders recognized, the Constitution protects religious freedom to secure the rights endowed to man by his very nature. On this day, we honor the history and the commitment to the preservation of religious freedom.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim January 17, 2019, as Religious Freedom Day. I call on all Americans to commemorate this day with events and activities that remind us of our shared heritage of religious liberty and that urge us to persevere and secure this blessing both at home and around the world.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth day of January, in the year of our Lord two thousand nineteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and forty-third.

DONALD J. TRUMP

TRIBUTE TO LYNDA DELAFORGUE

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 2019

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an outstanding progressive warrior: Lynda DeLaForgue. Co-director of Citizen Action/Illinois, the largest progressive public interest organization in the state, Lynda has left an indelible mark on laws and policies that directly impact our families and institutions. A skillful, smart and strategic leader, she has had an outsized impact—one that has made untold thousands of people’s lives better. While her death last weekend is a tremendous loss for all of us who worked with her, admired her and loved her, her legacy will remain strong for decades to come.

Lynda liked to quote Eleanor Roosevelt, and one of her favorite quotes was this one: “A woman is like a tea bag; you never know how strong it is until it’s in hot water.” Lynda took those words to heart. In fighting against payday loans or for affordable health care, Lynda was “Eleanor Roosevelt”. She was the epitome of “persistence”—fighting for financial protections, green energy solutions, or democracy reforms. Whether you served in local, state or federal government, when Lynda reached out you knew she would have facts, solutions and people behind her. And you knew that she would not give up until she had succeeded.

I first met Lynda when she worked for the Illinois Public Action Council as a door-to-door canvasser, office manager and voter registration organizer. She expanded her role to work on consumer issues—health policy, financial protections, marriage equality, and energy—always being sure to link policy to the real people and to organizing. In 1997, she became associate director—and three years later co-director—of Citizen Action/Illinois. While there, she and co-director William McNary made Citizen Action/Illinois an innovative and effective organization, recognized throughout Illinois and the country.

Throughout her career, Lynda focused on an underlying idea: that we can empower people to demand and organize on their own behalf to win a more just, fair and opportunity-filled society. It is an idea easier to state than to achieve, but Lynda knew the keys to success: to have convictions, persistence, and to work hard. She also knew the power of organizing, as exemplified by her ability to do exactly that, and she always took time to mentor and train her staff and provide solid counsel to her allies and aspiring young organizers and leaders. There is no one who combined all these attributes more than Lynda.

Even as she struggled with colon cancer, Lynda kept her eyes on the task at hand. She was actively engaged in leading the progressive political coalition that she built. She used her own experiences with the health care system to promote reform and access. She was on the phone with my office talking about the possibilities before us in the 116th Congress even as she was getting her chemotherapy treatments.

Lynda brought the same joy and passion to her private life as to her justice work. Everyone enjoyed being with Lynda. She was interested in others and interesting to be around. She was excited to travel, whether exploring her French roots or discovering new avant-garde artists. Above all, she was devoted to her family: her sister Laura, her children Katy and Jordan, and her life partner Brian Reinfield. To them, and to Lynda, we extend our sincere sympathy and our hope that they will take some comfort in knowing how many people loved and are inspired by Lynda.

As Eleanor Roosevelt told us, “One’s philosophy is not best expressed in words; it is expressed in the choices one makes . . . and the choices we make are ultimately our responsibility.” Lynda DeLaForgue chose to live a life of conviction and action. I will miss her very much.

RECOGNIZING THE MARTIN LUTHER KING COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COACHELLA VALLEY

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Martin Luther King Commemorative Committee of the Coachella Valley for their dedication to celebrating the life and legacy of Dr. King.

Since 1986, the MLK Commemorative Committee has kept Dr. King’s dream alive. It is my honor to present Mr. Beaver with the Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments as a service member and civil rights leader.

While the manifestations of racism and prejudice may have changed, the injustice Dr. King battled endures today. Racism endures. Inequality endures. Dr. King prophesized that the arc of history bends toward justice, but the road there has never been smooth.

As we remember Dr. King, we cannot relegate him to the history books. To keep his legacy alive, we must stand up to hatred, white supremacy, and the systematic racism that continues to plague our nation. In doing so, we embrace the values Dr. King lived: justice, equality, and the courage to do what is right.

That is the mission of the Commemorative Committee: not to simply remember Dr. King once a year, but to inspire us to carry on his spirit in our hearts and enact his vision of love and equality. It’s a message of freedom that, through their efforts, rings across the Coachella Valley and every valley, hill, and stream across our nation.

On behalf of the residents of California’s thirty-sixth congressional district, I congratulate the Martin Luther King Commemorative Committee of the Coachella Valley for their commitment to celebrating the life of Dr. Martin Luther King. I thank them for their service to our community.
Mr. BLUMENTHAUER. Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Comprehensive Care for Seniors Act of 2019. This legislation would direct CMS to promulgate the long overdue PACE final rule by April 1, 2019.

PACE is a proven care model delivering high-quality, comprehensive, integrated and coordinated community-based care to both Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries 55 years of age or older, who meet the criteria for a nursing home level of care, but wish to live at home. Multiple studies show that people receiving care from PACE organizations live longer, experience better health, have fewer hospitalizations and spend more time living at home than those receiving care through other programs.

PACE is a comprehensive, capitated, fully integrated, provider-based health plan. At present, there are 124 PACE organizations operating in 31 states, serving over 45,000 elders and those living with disabilities every day. PACE operates based on the fundamental principle that it is preferable in terms of quality of life, quality of care, and costs to public and private payers for PACE-eligible individuals to be served in the community whenever possible. Ninety-five percent live at home in their communities.

The PACE organization assesses each individual upon enrollment and develops a personalized care plan, implemented primarily by PACE staff across all settings of care twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Most PACE participants, 90 percent, are dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid. The average participant is 76 years of age, and lives with multiple chronic, complex medical conditions, which often significantly limit activities of daily living. Approximately half live with dementia. Thus, PACE organizations enroll an exclusively high-risk, high-cost population, with 85 percent being at least 65 years of age, and 15 percent between the ages of 55 and 64.

When individuals with chronic and medically complex conditions do not have access to care, their quality of life is diminished, which over time leads to increased expenditures. PACE deliberately was constructed to address the chronic care needs of individuals by providing timely and clinically appropriate treatments and social supports.

Currently, PACE programs operate under outdated regulations from 2006. It is critically important that CMS issue the PACE final rule, which will bring much needed regulatory flexibility, allowing PACE organizations to innovate and grow to best serve their participants, their families, and their communities. I urge all of my colleagues to join me to pass the Comprehensive Care for Seniors Act of 2019.
baseball career lasted only one season before he switched sports, becoming a member of the famed Harlem Globetrotters. A true patriot, Wilson left the Globetrotters to serve in the United States Army, later returning to the team until retiring in 1954. After the Harlem Globetrotters, Wilson returned to college where he obtained a teaching degree. He accepted a coaching position at Indianapolis Wood High School where he was named the first African-American coach at an integrated school in Indiana. In his eight seasons as coach, Wood teams won an astounding 139 games and lost 59.

After leaving Indianapolis, Wilson was hired as athletic director and later head basketball coach at Crane Community College in Chicago. The junior college was soon renamed in honor of civil rights figure Malcolm X. Wilson was head coach of Malcolm X basketball for 16 years where his teams won 378 games and lost 135, a .737 record. After retiring in 1989 from Malcolm X, he returned to his hometown of Anderson, where he became assistant at Anderson University with good friend, and then head basketball coach and athletic director, Barrett Bates. Wilson was known as a great ambassador to the community as assistant coach at AU. Wilson was dedicated to his players’ success and trumped the importance of working hard, often claiming there is no such thing as a “free lunch.” Encouraging players to go to class and get an education was instilled in his coaching philosophy. It was important to him that players were successful both on and off the court. Wilson was respected by other coaches and the people he worked with. He spent four seasons as an AU assistant coach and three years as a volunteer assistant coach at Anderson High School under Ron Hecklinski. After being passed over for a head coach position at Anderson High School more than once, Wilson become head coach for the girls’ basketball team. In 2002, he served as an assistant coach to his son, John E. Wilson Jr. at Lock Haven State College in Pennsylvania. Wilson was recognized consistently over the years for his excellence in athletics. His contributions were so significant, Anderson High School erected a statue in his honor in 2016. He was inducted into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame in 1994, the Anderson University Athletic Hall of Fame in 1997, and was named Madison County’s 100 Greatest Athletes in 2012. Wilson was also honored as one of the Top 50 Athletes of the Century in Indiana and Co-Athlete of the Century by the Herald Bulletin with fellow teammate and AU Hall of Famer Carl Erskine. He won the Humanitarian Award for College and the Black Sports Pioneer Award from Alpha Kappa Sorority. Wilson was the recipient of the Distinguished Service and Citizen Awards from the Boy Scouts of America, the Masons, Black Expo, the City of Anderson and was chosen as a Goodwill Ambassador by the Harlem Globetrotters for life. Wilson enjoyed meeting young men and women at the Herald Bulletin’s Johnny Wilson Awards annual luncheon, where local multi-sport-student-athletes were honored. Wilson will be forever missed by his family, friends, colleagues, and the entire Anderson community. On behalf of Indiana’s Fifth Congressional District, I extend my deepest condolences to Wilson’s son, John E. (Jackie) Wilson Jr., daughters, Sherri Wilson and Gena Wilson-Stockard, brother, Gene (Mae Helen) Wilson, and his many grandchildren, great grandchildren, extended family and friends who mourn his loss. The Anderson and Hoo- sier community will forever miss his positive attitude, mentorship, and unwillingness to quit.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HAITIAN EDUCATIONAL EMPOWERMENT ACT OF 2019

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Haitian Educational Empowerment Act of 2019. Thought the current occupant of the White House may want to have us believe that all is well in Haiti while, parenthetically, speaking of the country in derogatory and disgusting terms, those of us who truly know this country, those of us who truly care about the country and the Haitian Diaspora, know that Haiti remains on the road to recovery. The rebuilding continues from not only Hurricane Matthew, but the 2010 earthquake and the cholera outbreak, all of which continue to provide roadblocks to Haiti’s full recovery. It is imperative that we do all that we can to ensure that the Haitian people receive the assistance they need to realize a vibrant, strong, and healthy democracy.

To that end, the Haitian Educational Empowerment Act of 2019 authorizes the Secretary of State to establish a scholarship program for Haitian students who have had their studies disrupted by the 2010 earthquake or Hurricane Matthew. Such scholarships will ensure that Haiti has access to the future teachers, doctors, lawyers and civil servants it will need to realize its full potential with strong democratic institutions and a strong economy.

Madam Speaker, I invite all of my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill—a bill that will help Haitians help Haiti as the country continues its hard work on its road to recovery.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TRENT KELLY
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to make it clear that had a recorded vote on H.J. Res. 28 been recognized and called, I would have voted no.

HONORING THE HARRISBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR EARN-ING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIA-TION OF TOWN WATCH “ROOKIE OF THE YEAR” AWARD

HON. SCOTT PERRY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the outstanding men and women of the Harrisburg Police Department on earning the National Association of Town Watch “Rookie of the Year” Award. On August 7, 2018, 16,780 law enforcement agencies across the Country held local National Night Out events, aimed at promoting police-community partnerships through neighbor-hood block parties and cookouts with offi-cers. Out of nearly 800 nationwide law enforce-ment groups who held a National Night Out for the first time, the Harrisburg Police Depart-ment was one of only three agencies in Pennsylvania selected for recognition. Law enforcement officers are heroes, and we must not take their service for granted. They put their lives on the line to keep our neighborhoods, homes, businesses and schools safe and secure. The National Night Out in August was just one more example of the Harrisburg Police Department’s continued charge to protect and defend the people they serve.

I’ve long appreciated the commitment and self-sacrifice of our law enforcement profes-sionals. On behalf of Pennsylvania’s Tenth Congressional District, I congratulate and extend my heartfelt thanks to the Harrisburg Police Department on this great accomplish ment, and wish them Godspeed as they continue serving and safeguarding our communities.

OATH CEREMONY ON JANUARY 25, 2019

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great honor and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who will take their oaths of citizenship on January 25, 2019. This memorable occasion will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana. America is a country populated by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On January 25, 2019, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world, will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Julia Sui Nei Mawi, Balida Hammond, Indiana: Julia Sui Nei Mawi, Balida McCraw, Song E. Paik, Bruno Frederic Penteado, Angel Chiang, Marcela Garciaclazo, Luis Antonio Huerta, Carmen Navarro Lopez, Tatiana Madon, Jorge Martinez, Lucia Tiscornia, Karina Furtic, Viktoryia Trenikinhu, Ana M. Anguiano, Jose Arturo Jimenez, Nishi Wairimu Muna, Elyahu Harold Herszberg, Tianlin Wang Ford, Tsoelopele Quincy Muwena, Haneen Abuhasan, Sofia Rebeca Cavazos; Belen Candelario, Ljubica Trajceski, Selenne Serna, Dijana Najdeski, Suthon Somjana, Elena Eshanova, Martin Paul Nowosadzki, and Dijana Najdeski, Suthon Somjana, Elena Eshanova, Martin Paul Nowosadzki, and Selenne Serna.
Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country of the people, by the people, and for the people. They believe that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on January 25, 2019. They, too, are American citizens, guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

RECOGNIZING MR. EDDIE FARRIS AS THE 2018–2019 WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT PROFESSIONAL OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT GAETZ
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Eddie Farris as the 2018–2019 Walton County Educational Support Professional of the Year. For seven years, Mr. Farris has served the Walton County School District with exceptional passion and an unwavering commitment to service.

It is recognized that the position of Plant Manager comes with numerous responsibilities, but Mr. Farris continues to dependably perform his many duties while exceeding at his profession. Remarkably, Mr. Farris does all this while consistently offering a warm smile to everyone who enjoys the pleasure of working with him.

Mr. Farris is cherished by his supervisors and colleagues for his incredible kindness and positive attitude. He generously considers the needs of both students and staff because of the immense pride he possesses for his school.

His support knows no bounds, as evidenced by his willingness to provide assistance whenever and whenever it is needed. Mr. Farris has displayed dedicated teamwork by working with the PTO in coordinating events, such as Fall Festivals and movie nights. He is to be commended for his steadfast desire to serve as a positive example for those who matter most—the students.

I am truly proud to have Mr. Farris as a constituent in Florida’s First Congressional District. I thank him for his good work, and wish him continued success in the future.

REJECTING WHITE NATIONALISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY

SPEECH OF
HON. ZOE LOFGREN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 41 to reject White nationalism and White supremacy. I applaud Mr. CLYBURN and the House for acting against hate speech. Representative King has rightly been stripped of committee assignments by his colleagues, but today’s vote has been a long time coming. His latest comments were not the first time Representative King has made ugly, offensive, demeaning, and unashamedly racist remarks. Unfortunately, for more than a decade now, House Republican leadership did nothing while Representative King freely espoused white nationalism, anti-Semitism, and bigotry. Today, under Democratic Leadership, the House is taking appropriate action against a member of the House who has time and again promoted hate speech in Congress and Republicans have finally acted to impose discipline for misconduct. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 41 to reject Representative King’s racism, bigotry, and hate.

RECOGNIZING MR. TIMOTHY W. COY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Timothy W. Coy for over four decades of extraordinary public service. Mr. Coy will retire this month from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense as a Team Chief after nearly a decade of providing accurate, rapid, and actionable guidance on a broad range of issues including legislative proposals and appeals, congressional hearing support, and statements of administration policy. Preceding his role with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Coy served his country in the United States Air Force (USAF). He received assignments as a member of the USAF “Thunderbirds” and the initial cadre of the F–117 “Stealth” fighter program. Mr. Coy worked through the ranks to receive the title of Crew Commander, where he became the Aide-de-Camp and Executive Officer for the Commander, 4th Air Division. More recently, Mr. Coy was selected to be one of nine Air Force Legislative Fellows and, in this capacity, specialized in defense policy for Senator Wayne Allard. After graduating the program, Mr. Coy worked for the United States Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), where he advocated for JFCOM programs on Capitol Hill as the Chief of Legislative Affairs. After a successful 27 years in the military, Mr. Coy retired from the USAF in 2004 to become the Deputy Director and, later, Director of Legislative Affairs for the Missile Defense Agency.

During his service with the Agency, Mr. Coy advocated for a $9 billion budget in Congress to help develop new missile defense systems that protect the United States and its allies from hostile ballistic missile attacks.

Mr. Coy has received numerous accolades throughout his distinguished career. In addition to earning the title of “Top Performer” in his Minuteman III training at officer training school, Mr. Coy has been selected as one of Strategic Air Command’s top missileers for assignment to the TOP HAND Program. Mr. Coy also attended Harvard University as a Senior Executive Fellow, where he earned a Certificate in Public Policy.

All who knew and worked with Mr. Coy will miss his leadership and strong work ethic. I am sad to see him leave, but even more proud to congratulate him on a well-earned retirement as he starts a new chapter in his life.

ROE V. WADE 46TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EARL L. “BUDDY” CARTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today as constituents of the First District of Georgia, and from across the nation, come to D.C. to be a voice for those who cannot stand up for themselves.

This year marks the 46th anniversary of the misguided U.S. Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade. It is a tragedy that since this ruling in 1973, millions of defenseless babies have been denied the right to life.

As a health care professional, father, and grandfather, I strongly believe that life begins at conception, and support the sanctity of human life.

This past Congress, I worked tirelessly alongside fellow Members and pro-life advocates in our fight to end abortion.

We accomplished a lot. Most notably, passing and signing into law H.J. Res. 43, which overturned the Obama administration’s rule preventing states from redirecting Title X funds away from abortion providers like Planned Parenthood.

Now, states have the freedom to distribute Title X grant money in a way that best serves the needs of their constituents.

Additionally, the House approved multiple pro-life bills including the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Each one of these bills represents a step forward in our fight to save the life of a child.

Rest assured, we are committed to continuing our fight for the precious lives of the innocent unborn in the 116th Congress.

I want to thank each and every person who have traveled to our Nation’s Capital today for the important occasion.

I look forward to meeting with my constituents and other Georgia residents to discuss pro-life values and initiatives for the upcoming year.
Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the first and most fundamental right guaranteed to every individual—life. Next week marks the 46th anniversary since the tragic ruling in Roe v. Wade. In that time, more than 60 million lives have been lost to abortion.

That's 60 million babies who were never given the chance to fulfill their potential as a future doctor, farmer, artist, or Member of Congress.

Last year the House made significant progress to protect life through the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and by urging the Trump administration to update Title X guidelines so that tax dollars for family planning services don't go to abortion providers.

I was proud to help lead that effort in the House, but I know we can't stop there. That's why I want to thank the hundreds of thousands of Americans from Kansas and throughout our country who are arriving in Washington this week to participate in the March for Life.

As part of this year's theme, Unique from Day One: Pro-Life is Pro-Science, we know that research has proven what pro-life Kansans have already known—that life is precious and it begins at conception.

As a proud father of three and a Kansan, I stand in support of the hundreds of thousands of fellow Kansans and Americans who will be the voice for the voiceless at the March for Life.

I want to thank Congressman SMITH for organizing the Special Order.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S287–S298

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 173–191, S.J. Res. 4, and S. Res. 20–24.

Measures Passed:

Medicaid Extenders Act: Senate passed H.R. 259, to extend the Medicaid Money Follows the Person Rebalancing demonstration, to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment.

Honoring the life of Richard Arvin Overton: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 10, honoring the life of Richard Arvin Overton, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Minority party's committee membership: Senate agreed to S. Res. 21, to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

Measures Considered:

No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 109, to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 48 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 7), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Strengthening America’s Security in the Middle East Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Friday, January 18, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to authorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Thomas A. Summers, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2020.

Mark Lee Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior.

Donald W. Washington, of Texas, to be Director of the United States Marshals Service.

Greg Girard Guidry, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Michael T. Liburdi, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

Messages from the House:

Measures Referred:

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Executive Communications:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Privileges of the Floor:

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—7)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 4 p.m. and adjourned at 6:32 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Friday, January 18, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on pages S297–98.)
Committee Meetings
(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Armed Services: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 116th Congress:

Subcommittee on Airland: Senators Cotton (Chair), Wicker, Tillis, Sullivan, Cramer, McSally, Scott (FL), King, Blumenthal, Warren, Peters, Duckworth, and Jones.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity: Senators Rounds (Chair), Wicker, Perdue, Scott (FL), Blackburn, Manchin, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, and Heinrich.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Senators Ernst (Chair), Fischer, Cramer, Blackburn, Hawley, Peters, Shaheen, Heinrich, and Hirono.

Subcommittee on Personnel: Senators Tillis (Chair), Rounds, McSally, Scott (FL), Gillibrand, Warren, and Duckworth.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support: Senators Sullivan (Chair), Fisher, Ernst, Perdue, McSally, Blackburn, Kaine, Shaheen, Hirono, Duckworth, and Jones.

Subcommittee on SeaPower: Senators Perdue (Chair), Wicker, Cotton, Ernst, Tillis, Hawley, Hirono, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Kaine, and King.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Senators Fischer (Chair), Cotton, Rounds, Sullivan, Cramer, Hawley, Heinrich, King, Warren, Manchin, and Jones.

Senators Inhofe and Reed are ex-officio members of each subcommittee.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 56 public bills, H.R. 20, 634–688; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 5; and H. Res. 57–60, were introduced. Pages H715–19

Additional Cosponsors: Page H721

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, Chaplain, United States Senate, Washington, DC. Page H681

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. Pages H681, H699

Recess: The House recessed at 9:57 a.m. and reconvened at 10:04 a.m. Page H687

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Representative Welch, to rank after Representative Heck. Page H687

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, January 15th.

Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act of 2019: H.R. 150, to modernize Federal grant reporting, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nays vote of 422 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 41. Pages H688–89

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation: H.J. Res. 30, disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, by a 2/3 yeas-and-nays vote of 362 yeas to 53 nays, Roll No. 42; Pages H692–96, H698

Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act: Concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 251, to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security; and Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To extend by 15 months the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.". Pages H696–97

Rejected the Granger motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 195 yeas to 222 nays, Roll No. 43. Pages H692, H698–99

H. Res. 52, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 40, after the previous question was ordered without objection. Pages H683, H687–88

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 57, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. Page H699

Recess: The House recessed at 1:17 p.m. and reconvened at 1:52 p.m.

Order of Business—Passage of H.J. Res. 28: Agreed by unanimous consent to vacate proceedings by which House Joint Resolution 28 was passed, and the motion to reconsider laid upon the table, to the end that the Chair put the question on passage of House Joint Resolution 28 de novo, and further that if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered on the question of passage of House Joint Resolution 28, further proceedings may be postponed through the legislative day of January 23, 2019, as though under clause 8 of rule 20. Subsequently, the question was put on passage of House Joint Resolution 28, the ayes prevailed by voice vote, the yeas and nays were demanded, and further proceedings were postponed. Pages H702

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, January 18th. Page H703

Recess: The House recessed at 3:37 p.m. and reconvened at 4:35 p.m.

Recess: The House recessed at 4:35 p.m. and reconvened at 4:42 p.m.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H687–88, H688–89, H698, and H698–99. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
JANUARY 18, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Friday, January 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, Strengthening America’s Security in the Middle East Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Friday, January 18

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 10:30 a.m.
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