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 The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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.

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. Pingree). 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. 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...
business to lay off 20 percent of its
workforce on Federal contracts supporting
small business in my district that
ners have been furloughed or are work-
ing for essential services in our com-
nunities like roads, schools, and even
nutrition assistance programs.

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 responsi-
bility 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 dis-
bursement of over $700 billion in funding
for essential services in our commu-
nities like roads, schools, and even
nutrition assistance programs.

This decision by the Federal judge is
very good news, but we must continue
to work live up to our responsibili-
ties under the American Constitution,
and we can do that with a 2020 Census
that depicts a precise population count
through accurate data, adequate area
coverage, and appropriate and acceptable
questions that everybody in all com-
nunities can answer.

BORDER SECURITY

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given per-
m ission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

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 pro-
posed southern border wall. They will
tell you that a border wall is not need-
ed; it is immoral; it won’t fix the coun-
try’s illegal immigration problem.

I currently represent Florida’s Third
Congressional District, and here I have
a picture of my district’s public cre-
ative 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 pro-
posed wall for all passersby to see. The
wall reads: “Keep the government
shutdown until the wall is funded. Call
Congress. We the people demand Con-
gress 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 and my colleagues on the other side. I have heard from hundreds of my constituents who are in support of the wall. Their voices have been heard, and I will remain strong for border security and protecting this Nation.
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SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise to impl ore the President to stop holding Federal workers hostage and immediately end this shutdown.

I think every day of the TSA agent 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 fact is that the TSA and FAA workers keeping our skies safe, the TSA and FAA workers keeping our skies 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 allotted rank- ing minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. Be it further resolved that 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 (a)(2) of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there a motion to suspend the rules?

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as 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 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 request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Nearly 800,000 Federal employees have now missed a paycheck since the shutdown began. Some estimates say those employees have lost an average of $5,000 each so far. These hardworking Americans are law enforcement officers and National Park Service, EPA, FDA, and IRS employees, and many others in dedicated Federal service whose families are needlessly suffering. These employees are either furloughed or being forced to work without pay. This is not an acceptable way to govern. I may not have been a Member of this body as long as some people here, but I don’t think there is a single Democrat or Republican, who doesn’t care about securing our border, but it is foolish to think that keeping our government is what will in any way help secure the border.

You know what Border Patrol and Coast Guard members want more than a wall? They want their paychecks to come on time.

Democrats have made it clear, we are more than willing to come to the table to talk about sensible border security, but the first step has to be to reopen the government and get our government back to functioning.

This majority has already voted to open the government seven times, with support from across the aisle. But Senator Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has yet to act on any of these bipartisan pieces of legislation, the same legislation, I might add, that has already passed the Senate.

There are more than 100 freshmen Members of this body, consisting over 20 percent of the House, who have never worked in a functioning Federal Government due to the Senate’s inaction. All of our constituents, both Republican and Democrat, are suffering paycheck checks having to put food on the table. But now Jennifer has new hardships to face: how to feed her family on only her income, how she could make the holidays special while not knowing when her husband’s next paycheck will be coming. Their child requires an expensive medical procedure, and she has to pay for medical 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 their payment should not be the reality forced upon hardworking Federal employees.

The debts these workers incur during the shutdown will follow them long after the government is reopened. The hits to their savings accounts and marks on their credit scores will serve as painful reminders that they are represented by a government that will put them in harm’s way over a policy dispute.

First, a newlywed with a premature baby who spent more than 3 weeks in the NICU, has been without an income since her husband’s paychecks stopped coming. Their child requires an expensive medical procedure, and they have to shield her kids from her constant worry over the absence of that income.

This is an embarrassment. Too many Federal workers were already living paycheck to paycheck before those paychecks stopped coming. Their child requires an expensive medical procedure, and they have to shield her kids from her constant worry over the absence of that income.

The Speaker immediately ordered that this government shutdown, the longest government shutdown in our Nation’s history.

The impacts of the shutdown on my constituents and Americans across the country.

Second, the wife of a Coast Guard member’s mate, wrote to my office to detail the hardships her family is facing. Her husband has served in the Coast Guard for 19 years. They are used to stressful deployments, and her children are proud of their father’s service. But now Jennifer has new hardships to face: how to feed her family on only her income, how she could make the holidays special while not knowing when her husband’s next paycheck will be coming. Their child requires an expensive medical procedure, and she has to pay for medical bills, including her mortgage, and has had to borrow money from her family.

The debts these workers incur during the shutdown will follow them long after the government is reopened. The hits to their savings accounts and marks on their credit scores will serve as painful reminders that they are represented by a government that will put them in harm’s way over a policy dispute.

First, a newlywed with a premature baby who spent more than 3 weeks in the NICU, has been without an income since her husband’s paychecks stopped coming. Their child requires an expensive medical procedure, and she has to pay for medical bills, including her mortgage, and has had to borrow money from her family.

The fear and anguish in these messages from our neighbors is palpable. It should resonate with every Member of this body. These stories should keep all of us up at night. If we didn’t come to Washington to serve these dedicated and hardworking Americans, then just who are we here to serve?
When the government does eventually reopen, fortunately, many of these Federal employees will receive back pay, 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 sector entities, but the not the real ones harmed by the shutdown.

Federal contractors are generally small businesses, cleaners, builders, food service workers, and tech support workers 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 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 it is strategically 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 employees to make sure planes are safe to land, and not enough employees to direct air traffic in our skies.

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 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 strong, 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.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKOV. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative SCANLON from Pennsylvania for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I agree with Representative SCANLON. I want to open the government. Republicans want to open the government. Democrats want to open the government. So I respectfully ask House and Senate Democrats to stop holding our Federal workers hostage.

You know, on December 20, I voted for and Republicans voted for in the House a bill right here, standing right here on December 20, that would have kept the government open, and then we would not have had any of these discussions or need for these bills, because the government would still be open.

Unfortunately, not one Democrat Member of the House voted for it.

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 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 to put our Federal contractors and their families in 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 in our 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 the House measure, mostly because of their 60-vote rule, where they need Democrats to get on board, and parts of the government 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 no plans to take this one 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 bill that the Senate had 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 will try 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 a border State. If we are going 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, to BIGGS. Madam Speaker, thank the gentleman 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.

Now, 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—they are the most rugged land and terrain in 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 that you are supposed to protect. I blame you, Democrats and Republicans alike, for bringing this crisis 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 and Sonora, Mexico in the summertime, blazing heat of 120 degrees or more; in the winter time, the evenings cool down to the 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 or the fact that 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, when a 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 Blisbee, between Naco, Nogales 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 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 coming across. 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 we have 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 of 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 comes these folks. We don’t know that 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 ports of entry.

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 ports 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 know. 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 nothing. 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, workers, some being paid, some pouring across our border, and we are expecting them to stop them. They don’t have the resources because we are not providing them.

It is time to end this needless show of work. We are 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 feel 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. 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 here. We are asking you to sit down at the table and have a discussion. It is shut down because the other side doesn’t want to talk about border security.

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 right-wing 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 the balance of my time.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I don’t know when this shutdown will end, but I know that Democrats and all the Republicans who are serious about getting Federal employees back to work will vote in favor of this rule and the underlying resolution.

I am heartened by my colleagues from across the aisle who have already voted to reopen the government, and I hope that even more will join us this time around.

No Member of Congress can claim that any Member of this House is against border security. Not only have we sworn an oath to protect and defend this country, but we have voted repeatedly to fund billions of dollars in border security appropriations.

The discussion about the best methods for protecting our border is a valid policy question that should be debated thoughtfully and deliberately by both sides of the aisle as we seek a vehicle for the President to fulfill a campaign promise at the expense of American families.

It cannot be overstated: this is the longest government shutdown in history. The House has done its job. We have passed bills to open the government on bipartisan votes and will continue to do so for as long as it takes. We have committed to working on solutions to border security once the government is opened back up. The votes are there in the Senate. They have already shown that. And given the chance, I am sure they would show it again.

Why won’t Senator MCCONNELL bring to the floor any one of the House-passed bills to open the government? I will end by saying this: Senator MCCONNELL, do the right thing for working families in your State, in my State, and across the country. Hold a vote to open the government.

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.

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

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

The question was taken; and the adoption of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making 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.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam 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. 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  Cissner
AgUILar  Clarke (MA)
Alfred  Clarke (NY)
Anne  Clay
Arrington  Cleaver
Bass  Clyburn
Beaty  Cohen
Bera  Connolly
Beyer  Cooper
Boston  Correa
Buxton  Cromer
Bunning  Crenshaw
Cisneros  Cres ´ a
Brown (CA)  Cuellar
Brownley (CA)  Cummings
Bustos  Cunningham
Butlerfield  Davis (KS)
Carbajal  Davis (CA)
Cárdenas  Davis, Danny K.
Carson (IN)  Dean
Carstensen  DeFazio
Cartwright  DeGette
Casten (IL)  DeLauro
Castor (FL)  DelBene
Castro (TX)  Delgado
Chu, Judy  Demings
Cicilline  Desaulnier

DEATH—1

Mr. HECK of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 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.

The recess having expired, the House stood in recess.

□ 1004

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE) at 10 o’clock and 4 minutes a.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. WELCH, Vermont, to rank after Mr. Hatch of Washington.
Messrs. CALVERT, DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and FERGUSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. LUJAN, Madam Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 40.

GRANT REPORTING EFFICIENCY AND AGREEMENTS TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 150) to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

**[Roll No. 41]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYs—190</th>
<th>NAYs—422</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aderhold</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amash</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirakis</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bose</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (IN)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushnell</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushnell</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (GA)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline (NJ)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaway</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson (OH)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Rodney</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealrie</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz-Balart</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eilberg</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engel</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engstrom</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggum</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhart</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escobar</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estes</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esty</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyman</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farenthold</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farris</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faso</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrante</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferraro</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanagan</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foran</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foerder</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franks</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankel</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frelinghuysen</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freniere</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freniere</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frerichs</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garman</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia (CA)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia (IL)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garamendi</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garzon</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmendia</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 and those workers who use these 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 reopen 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 support this legislation and reopen the government through February 28. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (division C of Public Law 115-245) is further amended by striking the date specified in section 105(3) and inserting “February 28, 2019.”

This joint resolution may be cited as the “Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. GRANGER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?
get to their jobs, jobs that they are working at day in and day out without pay.

That is no way to run a country, and House Democrats won’t stand for it.

Let’s pass this bill to reopen the government and get the American people the paychecks that they deserve for the important work they do to protect the public, our food, our parks, and our families who are suffering so much as a result of them being used as hostages and political pawns by this President.

Ms. GRANGER. 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. We have to work together. We all have to sit down at the table and decide how we can move forward.

Mr. MCCRACKEN, was the guy that opened it. He said just a few years ago it was about theACA, nor was it about the level of education funding when Gingrich shut down the government or when Ted Cruz and his 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, 40,000 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 effectively and efficiently 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.

And we don’t do it. It is a stupid policy. 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, 40,000 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 effectively and efficiently 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.

And we don’t do it. It is a stupid policy. 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, 40,000 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 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 fact 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 failings.” We have got to come to the table with a “critical infrastructure” or “tactical 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 Coast Guard cutters. 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.

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

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

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, this great body 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.

Senator, if you put one single bill on the floor of the House to open the government. So it is not partisanship; it is not rancor. It is not...
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 befalling 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.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. My colleagues, end this Trump shutdown, vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 befalling 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 reading of the joint resolution.

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

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. 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 workers, 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 gentlewoman 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: reopening the government, pay Federal employees, and then negotiate on border security and immigration policy.

It is 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 yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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.

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 Speaker 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 219(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 JSC EuroSibEnergo (‘‘ESE’’)."

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
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 oligarch from 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 JSC 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 Russian 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?

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
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 (Ms. Waters) the chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. Waters. Mr. Speaker, you have heard all 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.

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 that we don’t align ourselves 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 what 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. 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.

Mr. Engel. 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 colleagues on this.
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 into Christmas trees 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 radio 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 Special Committee on Intelligence have expressed their national security concerns about this deal, but Trump wants us to rely on texts, 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. He was of a Trump foundation-type group, his ex-wife, and a sanctioned Russian bank.

Treasury refuses to identify for us any of these new, so-called “independent” directors. But what we do know is that the chair of one of these companies is someone who is under investigation by the British Parliament and who cannot see classified information, and the chair of another one is a cheerleader for the Russian invasion and annexation of Crimea and their war with Ukraine.

All of this misconduct is happening against the backdrop of a President 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 election of Donald Trump pays him bigger dividends in driving to undermine Western democracy and our way of life.

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

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 we need an expert on the 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 gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McCaul. I continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hooyer), who is our majority leader and the author of this joint resolution.

Mr. Hooyer. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and I thank the ranking member for his leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, I join Mr. Himes in saying this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue of America and whether or not we are going to hold accountable those who would threaten and undermine the interests of the United States.

I thank Mr. McCaul for his principled leadership on this issue, and I thank Chairman Engel for his continuing focus on making America secure.

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 owns 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.

I am deeply disappointed that the Republican Senate rejected a similar resolution yesterday. When I say they rejected it, the majority of the Members of the Senate—57 to be exact—supported this resolution.

I wanted to speak to Secretary Mnuchin yesterday and the day before, and I asked Secretary Mnuchin: Given the concerns about this legislation, about this withdrawing of sanctions on RUSAL, that they give us until February 28 to have hearings to reflect upon and have further discussions with the administration and make a determination whether we thought this action was in the best interests of our country.
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 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 with this negotiation.

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 to seek a better one. I think their intent was an honest intent. I am doubly sure 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. ENGLE. 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. ENGLE. 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 Chairman 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—when the administration appears to go easy on one of Putin’s closest pals, we understandably have serious questions. We need to see the whole picture, and right now we are not.

Congress cannot be left out of decisions this important. That is something I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand, and I hope we can send the administration a strong bipartisan message to that effect. This resolution represents Congress doing our job, exercising oversight and using checks and balances provided in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the House voted on a motion to suspend the rules and pass 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 (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 colleagues. 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. ENGLE. 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.

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 251) to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 20 minutes.

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I came to the floor with Democratic and Republican leaders of the Homeland Security and Energy and Commerce Committees to urge the House to take urgent action to prevent termination of the Department of Homeland Security’s Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Standards program.

The House answered the call by passing H.R. 251 by an overwhelming margin of 414-3. Now, the Senate has acted on this critical legislation and sent H.R. 251 back with an amendment. It falls to the House to get it to the President’s desk.

Although 414 Members of the House sent a strong message to the Senate...
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. THOMPSON of Mississippi. 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 prevent this program from expiring, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, and I am prepared to close after the gentleman from Texas closes.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of H.R. 251, as amended by the other body.

This amendment is far from ideal, but we have no other choice but to accept it. The most compelling reason not to oppose this amendment from the gentleman from Texas is that we passed last week by 414 votes that it expires at midnight tonight, and that means the ability to check our facilities goes away. It is very problematic.

Let me repeat that. By law, the authority to conduct inspections, protect security vulnerability information from terrorists, and help facilities with technical help to make them secure, it all disappears unless this bill is amended and passes the House and goes to the President.

We must, as 414 of us did last week, keep the existing CFATS program authority going. I am glad we have a chance to do that here.

The Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Standards Program was launched to surgically and directly 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, to prevent terrorist incidents. The focus 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 didn't offer program stability and stagnated the program's improvement.

It is no surprise to me that CFATS made its largest program improvements when it had 4 years of authority and not just 1 year. Moreover, 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 after the笑s 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 still 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.

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, FALLONE, WILDER, 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 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 to H.J. Res. 28;

Passage of H.J. Res. 28, if ordered;

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

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

DISAPPROVAL OF PRESIDENT’S PROPOSAL RELATING TO APPLI-
CATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the 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 yea and nay votes 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:

[Vote list follows]

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 Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 1240, not voting 126, as follows:

[Vote list follows]
**CORRECTION**

**January 17, 2019**

**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cline</th>
<th>Clough</th>
<th>Collin (GA)</th>
<th>Collins (NY)</th>
<th>Comer</th>
<th>Conaway</th>
<th>Cook</th>
<th>Crawford</th>
<th>Cummings</th>
<th>Cummings (SC)</th>
<th>Cullen</th>
<th>Davis, Rodney</th>
<th>Davis, (NY)</th>
<th>Davis, David (CA)</th>
<th>Davis, (NH)</th>
<th>Davis, (IN)</th>
</tr>
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<td>Riggleman</td>
<td>Hudlow</td>
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<td>Ruymen</td>
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<td>Rogers (AL)</td>
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<td>Joyce (TY)</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Katsch</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Kelley (MA)</td>
</tr>
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<td>Collins</td>
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<td>Conway</td>
<td>Cook</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES**

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.
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 a 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 recorded vote.

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 vote null?

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. 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 let Members be subjected to missing that vote, which is a very important vote for them. And, therefore, I will have to object.
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 border 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 going to have the 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. SCALISE. This is a very critical vote. The government is shut down. We think the government should not be shut down.

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 go on the record (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 1 minute and 17 seconds.

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 the 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 were 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 a request was asked for because I understand that, 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 now 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 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 if I am 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 will 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 say that we will have that. We may return tomorrow if we can open up govern-
ment, if we have an agreement on that. But we will return as soon as that op-
tion is available to us.

But we will return, if that does not happen on the morning 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 busi-
tion, if we have an agreement on that.

I do recall a number of occasions when we were in the majority where there were times where maybe a Mem-
er wasn’t recorded on a vote. They might have just gotten in as the vote was closed and wanted to have recon-
consideration, and, after conversation, it is always the right thing to do to make sure that these proceedings go in ac-

driving force. I am a proud, proud American cit-
zen, a proud husband, father, son, and grandfather.

I come to you today in the midst of the longest shutdown in the history of this country. I am disgusted that the issue here isn’t about protecting vet-
erans or Americans’ healthcare or edu-
cation. Instead, it is about the demand for Trump’s wall.

Last week, I voted to end the shut-
down. The bill passed this House, and it sits in the United States Senate. Last year, the Senate unanimously passed before the same funding bill, so 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 pay-
check.

Trump’s shutdown is hurting the Coast Guard, that, right now, is protecting our national security. No pay for the nearly half a million federal workers and families who rely on food banks to feed their families.

The Trump shutdown is literally en-
dangering 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 Trump 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 epitaph. 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.

On the 22nd of this month, we will mark the centennial anniversary of the misguided Supreme Court decision, Roe v. Wade, which legalized abortion, without restriction, nationwide.

Since the 1973 decision, more than 54 million children have been murdered in the United States alone. This is the epic tragedy of our time, and we must stand up for the unborn.

We stand in solidarity with those marching and are determined to defend the sanctity of human life. We thank them for sharing their convictions with dauntless courage.

RESTORING FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR SHELTERS

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

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, as a freshman Member of this body, I take deep offense at the suggestion a little while ago here on the House floor by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that House Democrats are responsible for this government shutdown.

To the contrary, their leader in the Senate has failed his responsibility to the American people to bring a vote to the Senate floor on any of the nine appropriations bills passed by the House that would reopen this government.

A few days ago, I visited Turning Point of Lehigh Valley in my district, a shelter that assists survivors of abuse and their families and that has stopped receiving Federal funding as a result of this shutdown. When I return to my district tomorrow, I will be visiting with more organizations that have been similarly affected.

The shelter has a long waiting list. So while it does extraordinary work, it already struggles to maintain the funding it needs to take in all those who are suffering in the community, and that is the case in many communities across our country.

So, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle wish to do something constructive, they should go see their leader in the Senate and urge him to bring a vote to the floor.

SANCTITY OF LIFE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, this past June, our family was rocked by a very scary incident. We were excited and joyfully anticipating the birth of our very first grandchild. A boy whose name would be Silas. Our excitement and joy quickly turned to fear and dread when Silas was born lifeless, the umbilical cord tightly wound around his neck three times.

I was in the waiting room when I received a text from my wife, and she said:

Pray now. Silas was born, but he's not breathing. They're working on him.

I began praying, and about 15 minutes later, my wife, Amie, frantically ran into the waiting room in tears and said:

He's still not breathing. Pray harder. Pray harder.

Instinctively, I fell to my knees, and I pled, crying to God:

Please, God, save his life. Breathe life into him.

I realized in that moment what I have known for all my life, and that is that human life is valuable, precious, and fragile.

Thanks be to God, about 10 minutes later, the doctor walked into the room and said:

He's breathing, finally, and we think he's going to make it.

Two days ago, Silas turned 6 months old, and I cannot wait to see what God has planned for him. Silas fought for his life, and I am so thankful he will get to experience all that life has to offer.

Members, every innocent child should have a chance at life. God forbid, we would allow that fragile, precious, valuable, innocent life to be taken.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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.
Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I rise today because this month marks 46 years since Roe v. Wade was decided.

Since that decision, there have been over 60 million abortions. I am not sure there is any other way to describe this statistic other than the word "horrible." With that being said, I also rise today to recognize the thousands of people who travel to Washington every year to fight for the unborn.

Madam Speaker, the pro-life movement in America is growing. Why? Because it is a movement about love and about promoting a culture of life. By promoting a culture of life, these folks are advocating for more than just saving the unborn babies. Although that is extremely important, Madam Speaker, this is a fight for the dignity of life that says we need to view people as assets to our society and not as liabilities.

When we view people as assets, it means we are giving those who are trapped in a cycle of poverty a real shot to make it in this life; and when we view people as assets, it means we are seeing those with disabilities as contributors—and nothing less.

I want to close by thanking all the people—those from North Carolina, who give a voice to the voiceless. They are an inspiration to me and to many others around the country.

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF SHUTDOWN
(Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER. 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.

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 to honor Hershel ‘Woody’ Williams for his service and commitment to the ideals that make 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 as 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.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of the dignity of human life.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today 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 and to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 now 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 for 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 literally 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 individuals 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 debate, 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, and we stand ready to support the women who face the challenges of an unexpected pregnancy. We also know 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 soldiers, doctors and pharmacists, police officers and teachers, clergy and judges. Perhaps most importantly, they 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. Marshall very much for his comments and, again, for his leadership. I am so glad to have him here.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman Smith, not only for his tireless leadership, but his compassionate, passionate voice on behalf 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?

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.

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 who 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 thank him for that.

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 that.

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 of dismemberment, had pulled out piece by piece. They are all horrible, whatever stage they are, because they are snuffing out that life.

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 dismemberment, 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 for 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 unborn babies, 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 Congresswoman 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 one thing God can make adults with. If we don’t give Him back what He has given to you, 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 or by the Bill of Rights, 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 deal with.

There is a book by author Simon Sinek that says, “Start With Why.” Why does it 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 able to come 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 from 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. Bergman 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 thank Mr. Smith for yielding.

Today I affirm that pro-life is also pro-science. Advances in science, especially ultrasound technology in medicine, make this clear, not just to parents, but to anyone who will see the live baby human growing inside a woman. They are talking not about a clump of cells as some like to refer to them, but indeed a baby human. As a result, the country is becoming increasingly pro-life.

Every single life has purpose and dignity. As Pope John Paul II, stated: Human life has dignity not because of the work people do, but because it is imprinted with God’s image.
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This week, I am proud to welcome pro-life leaders and friends from Ohio’s Eighth District traveling to Washington, D.C., for the March for Life.

Today, we look forward to the day when Americans will contritely turn away from abortion, perhaps as vigorously as they have rejected the aberrant etiology that led to the three-fifth compromise.

Know the women who have experienced abortion, I also hope that everyone will show kindness and mercy to those who wrestle with the enduring trauma with repentance. May God have mercy on them and on all of us.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

Madam 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 for 4 days. They took 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.

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 and should, 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 will 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 least little 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 900,000 in 2009, 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. They 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 some kind of modern-day flat Earth society, continues to cling to outdated, indefensible arguments cloaked in euphemism.
Even the seemingly benign word “choice” wavers 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 order 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 defend 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 compassionate and enlightened society could have allowed such an outrage to happen.

As STEVE CHABOT said earlier today, we know that the women are the victims. I and my wife and those of us in this 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 bore for so long. There are now many ministries that 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 to me, 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 shame 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 entitled 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 pretty clearly. At the moment of conception, when a sperm cell from a human joins together with an egg cell from a human, a new human life begins. Absolutely 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 genetics. We know that, at that moment, a unique human being has been formed with unique DNA.

My gosh, anyone 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 scientifically—is 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 has to be 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 nature of that human being. There only change is the change in the size. That is the only difference.

Despite being further along in development, adults are certainly no more humans than adolescents, adolescents no more 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 because they are uniquely human. They deserve human rights.

The science empowers us, and may indicate and encourage us today on the eve of the March for Life. In the words of the prophet Isaiah: “But those who hope in Me will renew their strength.”

This fact is not radical. It 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 nature of that human being. There only change is the change in the size. That is the only difference.

Despite being further along in development, adults are certainly no more humans than adolescents, adolescents no more 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 because they are uniquely human. They deserve human rights.

The science empowers us, and may indicate and encourage us today on the eve of the March for Life. In the words of the prophet Isaiah: “But those who hope in Me will renew their strength.”

“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 extraordinarily eloquent remarks.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

RIGHT TO LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Bost) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, as a father and a grandfather, I know the love that a family feels for their children, and it 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 family’s life that make this a very personal issue.

Thirty-eight years ago, my wife was a junior in high school. I had just left for 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 abort-saved, now serves in the United States Marine Corps and is a major and will probably 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, in the Marine Corps, when she actually took 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 questions that come up; such as, When does life begin?

Let me fast forward in our lives. Our oldest daughter, on July 26, 2002, discovered 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 communication, 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
Elliana 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 they should have to terminate 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 pro-life movement to help young women who may 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’d 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. The part that 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 innocent life, 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 to the world and he saw 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 written by my wife, Carrah.

[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 arrival 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 experience.

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—recognizing that 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 are 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 32 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 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 understand that there is a need.
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 didn't feel God put our friend in this position for a reason. She has a strong faith. She knew she could handle it, because God would have told her if he knew she would tell us that she just "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 "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. But if you are ending an innocent life on purpose, we're not sure what other way to put it.

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 unelected judges into the question of the beginning of life, more than 56 million babies have died at the hands of abortionists—56 million. Just let that sink in.

So how does she get 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 very 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 liberty, life, 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 want to look at her and not see a tiny baby who did maybe 1,000, I think he said, late-term abortions. It is difficult to take as he described.

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 in development, 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...
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.

And 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 crimes, terrible, terrible.

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. 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 ratio. But I keep hearing—and we have had hearings on it. People keep wanting to say that the biggest problem is this rising anti-Islam hate crimes, terrible, terrible.

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 descendents 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 is from people who say that it is okay to have it.

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-Jewish hatred. So, hopefully, this House can set the prophecies in motion by stopping the anti-Semitic comments.

For heaven’s sake, I have been mad at Senator Graham about 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 assassinize 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, excommunicated by the Palestinian Authority intelligence October 11 in Ramallah, and he has now been sentenced to life at hard labor because he told 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 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 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.

Why? Madam Speaker, it is because you don’t want everybody coming and parading through your home unless you invite them.

Yes, Madam Speaker, just because there are burglars who can get past your dead bolt lock or break through your window, you still have a wall. You still have dead bolts because it will help slow people down from trying to get in, and hopefully they will be afraid before they can get in and do damage.

Hopefully, just the presence of an outer wall around your home—I understand most people want to have interior walls to give family members some privacy, but if walls are immoral, why would you have one around your home, the outer wall of your home? It is because they work. They are not immoral.

Some people say, oh, it is a 14th century invention. Actually, it is more like a 3000 B.C. solution.

I have a picture in my office of some of our military there at a place called Ur, where Abraham came from. There has been a massive wall there since about 3000 B.C.

They are used to slow down people whom you don’t want coming in without your permission.

So it isn’t a 21st century problem with having people walk into your home or homeland unimpeded. It is as old as humanity itself, and walls can help.

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.

We ought to be doing the same thing because, if we allow this Nation to continue to have people pouring in, even those who have a leg to stand on, who are not illegal, 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 if they 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 top 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 they know it got 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 command economy because it didn’t work.

There is no way to ever go without a totalitarian government that tells you everything you can or can’t do.

Anyway, Israel, walls work, fences work, those barriers work. And I think this is a lovely wall and fence. 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, the people of the world, get a wall where we need it, but secure the whole thing. Then we dry up the money to the drug cartels and Mexico becomes a top ten economy; they have a burgeoning middle class and they have a better standard of living.

The best thing we can do for Mexico and Central America: build a wall where we need it; secure the border; cut off the money, then, flowing to the drug cartels; not 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 many national origins.

But the one thing the Iron Curtain, that was a different matter, because they were keeping people in that didn’t want to be in, shooting people that didn’t stay in.

But they work. That is why they are around prisons. That is why they are around jails or jail facilities. Yes, they work. We have found that for thousands of years.
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OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

- Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Rob-
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By Mr. HARTZLER:
H.R. 639. A bill to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that the 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.
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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 Agriculture, 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. STEWART):
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. MEANS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. GABRIAL, Ms. OAM, Ms. ESQUIVEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. POCAH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):
H.R. 643. A bill to prohibit the diversion 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 rights claims of the Pajaro Nation in Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BLOUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CORDERO Y DOMINGUEZ of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CRAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESaulnier, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESCHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANJELI, Ms. GABRIAL, Mr. GARAMendi, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNedy, Ms. KHANNA, Mr. KRISITANAMOURTH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEDU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEHRBACK, Mr. LENTHALL, Mr. LOWEY, Mr. LOUDY, Mr. MALDONADO, Mr. MCMALLEN, Ms. MCELHINNY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MUCARELPOWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NIELD, Mr. NORTON, Ms. OCAÑO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAH, Ms. PRIBESILEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-CALIFAN, Mr. SARABANES, Ms. SCALON, Ms. SCHAWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHOAIB, Mr. SQUIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON OF FLORIDA, and Mr. YARMUTH):
H.R. 645. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require State to State delivery of the voter list of an individual who provides identifying information to the State motor vehicle authority is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless the individual does not meet the eligibility requirements for registering to vote in such elections or declines to be included in the list of eligible voters in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAKOWSKY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DESaulnier, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEDU of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCALON, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MALFAR, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):
H.R. 646. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 28909 Washington Avenue in Murrieta, California, as the ‘‘Riverside County Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Memorial Post Office’’; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.
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H.R. 647. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs. To fund assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of careers in academic palliative medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:
H.R. 648. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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.
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H.R. 649. A bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China; to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and in addi-
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By Mr. CURRAN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):
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H.R. 652. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue a final regulation 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. JODELLE (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 653. A bill to provide grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support dual 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, Mr. CINNERS, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Ms. ROBERTS, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide employers with a credit against tax for increasing employee stock ownership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 655. A bill to provide grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support dual enrollment programs offering career and technical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HUSTON, Mr. CRISSAVERS, Mr. CARNES, Ms. CLARK of New York, Ms. DELAUR, Ms. MATSU, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHRES, Mr. SHAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. TILDEN of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WILSON of Michigan, Mr. OMAR, Ms. ENOCH, Mr. GARAMendi, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BEERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. KHANNA, Mr. Vela, Ms. OSCARIO-CORTEZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESPIRITUAL, Mr. TAYLOR of Maryland, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 656. A bill to require the Attorney General to make grants to nonprofit organizations to offer legal assistance to certain aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, 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. BARRAGAN, Mr. BERA, Mr. BISHOP of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWNLY of California, Mr. CRISSAVERS, Mr. CASE, Mr. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAMPBEL of New York, Mr. CORREIA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROW, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DIAZ-DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ENSHOO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HARRIS of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEE of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFOREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. NAPOLIz, Mr. NEAVE, Mr. OMA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PORTER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SPEIER, Mr. SPROOZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WILD, Ms. MUCARSLI-Powell, Mr. RuppERSBERGER, Mr. LUIJAN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. QUOILEY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SCHAFFER, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 657. A bill to transfer to employees of the Federal Government and the government of the District of Columbia affected by a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. CHU of California, Ms. MCELROY of Connecticut, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RIYAN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FORD of North Carolina, Mr. ESPIRITUAL, Ms. DINGELL, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BRENNAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMendi, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOFOREN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LANGVIN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ENSHOO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAMB, Mr. OMA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COURTNET, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ENOCH, Ms. KELLY, Mr. SCHRIF, Mr. MOORE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. CLARK of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. PINPEER, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KILMUR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 658. A bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects new or improved throughout 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. DEUTCH (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. LAMCEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MIKATOS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JONES, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRIOTTMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. SPANO, Mr. Latta, 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. DEVITO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. OMA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. NADURE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. KRISINAMOORTHI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAVER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KELL of Illinois, Ms. PENGree, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MACKIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BEERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. 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, Mr. BEATTY, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CARDENAS of New York, Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAUR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DAVIS of Mississippi, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BEERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. JEFFRIES):
Florida, Mr. Rush, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Collins of New York, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, and Mr. Green of Tennessee.

H.R. 668. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to include in periodic health assessments, separation history and physical examinations, and other assessments an evaluation of whether a member of the Armed Forces has been exposed to open burn pits or toxic airborne chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. Harris, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Long, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Babin, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Young, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Cloud, Mr. Rice of South Carolina, Mr. Olson, and Mr. Wenstrup of New York): A bill to protect the right of individuals to access water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Jones, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. McFadden, Mr. DT. Mc PRESSLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Sahlan, Mr. Lujan, Mr. Cole, Ms. DelBene, Mrs. Thompson of California, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Gomez, Mr. Gallego, Ms. McCollum, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Ruiz, Ms. Haaland, Mr. DeLauro, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. Olson, Mr. DeLauro, Mr. Gabbard, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Norton, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Payne, Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. POCAN, Mr. Welch, Mr. Christ, Mr. Carcagno, Mr. Serrano, and Mr. Courtiney): A bill to conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Biggs, Mr. Schweiikert, Mr. O’Halleran, Mrs. Lonsford, and Mr. Lamb): A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, for purposes of development of a water resource project by conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest to the City; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Davidson of Ohio, Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Wexer of Texas, Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, Mr. Huffman of West Virginia, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Westerner, Mr. Norman, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Flores, Mr. Baines, Mr. Cunaway, Mr. Olson, Mrs. Hartzler, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Babin, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Wagner, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Wright, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Estes, Mr. Harries, and Mr. STEVENS): A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for a credit against tax for improving the safety of fuel aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 664. A bill to protect the right of individuals to access water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Dritsch, Ms. Fudge, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Johnson of New York, Mr. Clarke of New York, Mr. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Soto, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Levin of Michigan, and Ms. Wilson of Florida): 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.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. Gibbs): A bill to repeal section 3003 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Dritsch, Ms. Fudge, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Johnson of New York, Mr. Clarke of New York, Mr. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Soto, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Levin of Michigan, and Ms. Wilson of Florida): 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.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. Correa, Mr. Carbajal, Ms. Traíb, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Ms. Omar, Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Mucarzel-Powell, Mr. Hastings, Ms. Garcia of Texas, and Mr. Soto): A bill to amend the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, and the Anti-terrorist Appropriations Act, 2018, and to make additional appropriations for the congressional leadership and members of such off-
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. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. TONG): 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. 681. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the application of the restriction on the appointment of relatives to a position in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SANCHEZ: H.R. 682. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require certain Federal officials to make requisite financial disclosures within 30 days of assuming office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Mr. GARCÍA-ELIÑA, 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 “PRÓMESA”), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY (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. 685. 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. McGovern, Ms. Moore, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. SHALALA): H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take such actions as are necessary to ensure that mail for eligible recipients of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is delivered in a timely manner.

By Mr. ZELDIN: H.R. 688. A bill to provide for the issuance of a PFC Garfield M. Langhorn Memorial Sesquicentennial Postage 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. MCMorris ROSS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. SHALALA): H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should be strengthened for future generations, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES: H. Res. 57. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BUI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BILIRIKIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mrs. 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. KAPTURE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. GABRIELA): 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 in effect 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:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among other powers, gives Congress the authority to establish a uniform rule of Naturalization.)

By Mr. HARTZLER: H.R. 639. 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. 644. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 provides Congress with the power to establish a “uniform rule of Naturalization.”

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah: H.R. 645. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 and Clause 18.

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 Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among other powers, gives Congress the authority to establish a uniform rule of Naturalization.)
power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 687.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1.
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.
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 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 650.
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. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 652.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

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).

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:

(1) 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 1 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 1, Section 8.

By Mr. DEUTCH:
H.R. 659.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. 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:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIJALVALA:
H.R. 665.
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. 666.
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.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 669.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:
H.R. 670.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:
H.R. 671.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 672.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 678.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 679.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 679.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Miss RICE of New York:
H.R. 680.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:
H.R. 680.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:
H.R. 681.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 18.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:
H.R. 682.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 18.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:
H.R. 683.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:
H.R. 684.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WALDEN:
H.R. 685.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 686.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GIBERS of Texas, Mr. MERKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LOEBER, Mr. DELIJIAN, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 9: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. ROY.

H.R. 11: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 549: Ms. SHALALA and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 553: Ms. DIgETTE 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. LIFINSKI, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 592: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 603: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. 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. SHIMEKUS.

H.R. 617: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 621: Mr. LONG, Mr. GORHAM, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.J. Res. 2: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. TUMMONS.

H. Res. 12: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 23: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. GIBBERD, and Ms. SCHAROWSKY.

H. Res. 33: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SIWELL of Alabama, Ms. SCHIAKOWSKY, and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 35: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER of West Virginia, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Res. 49: Ms. MENG, Mr. CHABOT, 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: offered by Mrs. LOWEY

H.R. 648, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits 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 unfailing love sustains us.
Give our lawmakers a great faith to live for as You deliver them from doubt, disillusionment, bitterness, cynicism, and frustration. Lord, teach them so to live and toil that they may face with clear consciences the gaze of their peers and the judgment of posterity.

Be near to the unpaid Federal workers and their families who are feeling the economic strains of this partial government shutdown. Lord, don’t permit these trials to overwhelm them.
And, Lord, touch with Your mercy the loved ones of the U.S. citizens killed in Northern Syria.
We pray in Your compassionate Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAT). 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, BLUMENTHAL, 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.

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

**CLOSURE 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. 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 called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURREN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPPO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea." The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) would have voted "yea."

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: [Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, and the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 30

Mr. SCHUMER. We spent the past few days debating the resolution of disapproval of the Treasury Department’s plan to relax sanctions on Russia. We have made clear that Treasury’s plan is insufficient and lets Putin and his cronies off the hook. We have made clear that Putin’s malign activities around the globe have not abated. We have made clear that there is no reason to relieve sanctions on one of our chief adversaries when there has been no reconciliation and no exchange for nothing.

Earlier this week, 10 brave Republicans joined us on the motion to proceed and again on cloture, but it was not enough for passage. So many other Republicans who have campaigned that Democrats are not tough enough on Putin, when they had a chance to be tough on Putin, ran for the exits. I just want to let my colleagues know that this House was different and in this case far more courageous.

The House passed the same resolution of disapproval 362 to 53. Republicans by more than a 2-to-1 ratio—more than 2 to 1—voted to not allow the loosening of sanctions on Deripaska’s Rusal, as 136 of them joined with the unanimous—unanimous—support of House Democrats to pass the resolution.

So two votes—two small votes—stand in the way of passage here in the Senate. Let the overwhelming bipartisan House vote be a message to my Republican friends in the Senate. We should pass this resolution. We should not let Putin get his way simply because Donald Trump has always wanted him to—too often.

So I am going to shortly reconsider the resolution before it expires tonight at midnight. I strongly urge my friend the leader not to block the request and give Republican Senators a chance to change their minds on this incredibly important matter.
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 no intervening action or debate; 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 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 concerned, as are Senator Hein-...
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 importance of advocating for 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 clerk 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.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, folks from all over the country—all ages, all backgrounds, and all walks of life—came 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?

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 globe, risking their lives on behalf of 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 just plain wrong. They can't leave the Coast Guard. 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 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.

There has been a lot of focus about the Coast Guard being impacted. They are working hard, saving lives in my State, certainly—in Alaska—all the time, and they are not getting paid. A lot of focus about the Coast Guard being impacted by the partial government shutdown.

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 being run by the United States, 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 this bill.

What did we do, 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 moved to hotline 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? 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. This is bipartisan. 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 get 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 Coast Guard will not understand why this bill is being blocked. Communities that support and depend on the Coast 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 Coast Guard—are getting paid and the men and women of the Coast 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 Coast 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 Coast 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 Senators permitted 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 resources has meaningfully informed 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 President’s message, 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. 268. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

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.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

ENROLLED BILL, SIGNED

At 5:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

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 Counselor of the CFPB, 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–AES1) 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
and second times by unanimous con-
and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr.
WYDEN, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. MERKLEY,
Mr. HINICH, and Mr. BOOKER):
S. 176. A bill to incorporate items 3005 of the
Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon
National Defense Authorization Act for Fin-
cial Year 2015; to the Committee on Energy
and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. RISCH,
Mr. HINICH, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr.
CRAPO):
S. 175. A bill to provide for the establish-
ment of a pilot program to identify security
vulnerabilities of certain entities in the en-
ergy sector; to the Committee on Energy and
Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms.
HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BENNET, Ms.
HIRANO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOK-
ER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr.
MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. SAND-
ERS):
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 Judici-
ary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BOOZ-
MAN, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. ERNST):
S. 176. A bill to amend the Internal Rev-
ue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on
estate transfers, and to provide for the tax-
skip-skip transfers; to the Committee on
Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. CAR-
DEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr.
CRAPO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RISCH,
Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms.
KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Mr.
BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr.
CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr.
SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms.
DUCOWTH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY,
Ms. CORTES MASTO, Mr. KOCH, Ms.
BALDWIN, Mr. HIRANO, Mr. HINICH, Mr.
SCHUMER, Mr. KINZ, Ms. SMITH, Ms.
KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BROW, Mr. MURRAY,
Mr. CARPER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER,
Mr. BENNET, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr.
MERKLEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ,
Mr. WYDEN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr.
ROBERTS):
S. 184. A bill to authorize the appropriation
of funds to the Centers for Disease Control
and Prevention for conducting or supporting
research on firearm violence; to the
Committee on Health, Education, Labor,
and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHBA (for herself, Mr.
COLLINS, Ms. COONS, and Mr. REED):
S. 185. A bill to require certain financial
assistance under the State energy program
and the Weatherization Assistance Program
to be distributed without undue delay to sup-
port State and local high-impact energy effi-
ciency and renewable energy initiatives; to
the Committee on Energy and Natural Re-
sources.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr.
LANKFORD, and Mr. PERDUE):
S. 186. A bill to require completion of the
current rounds on the budget and regular appropriations bills, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Home-
land Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr.
BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN,
Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HOEVEN,
and Mr. PETE):
S. 187. A bill to require Senate confirma-
tion of the Inspector General of the Bureau
of Consumer Financial Protection, and for
other purposes; to the Committee on Trans-
portation, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HYDE-SMITH:
S. 188. A bill to require a member of the Armed
Services to include in periodic health assess-
ments, separation history and physical ex-
aminations, and other assessments an eval-
uation of whether a member of the Armed
Forces has been exposed to toxic airborne
chemicals, and for other purposes; to the
Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KINZ (for himself, Mr. GARD-
NER, Mr. REED, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr.
BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROW, Mr. COONS,
Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DURBIN):
S. J. Res. 4. A joint resolution requiring the
advice and consent of the Senate or an Act 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.

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. ROBERTS, Mr. INHOFE,
Mr. ROUND, Ms. HYDE-SMITH, Mr.
BLUNT, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr.
RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL,
Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SASSIE, Mr. COTTON,
Mr. RISCH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARASSO,
Ms. BLACKBURN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr.
CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina,
Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs.
FISCHER, and Mr. ENZI):
S. 190. A bill to amend the Foreign Assist-
ance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance to
nonprofits, foreign nongovernmental organi-
zations, and quasi-autonomous nongov-
ernmental organizations that promote or per-
form abortions; to the Committee on Foreign
Relations.

By Mrs. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr.
SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr.
BOOZMAN, Mr. Brown, Mr. CASEY, Mr.
COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCOWTH, Mrs.
GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN,
Mr. KAIN, Mr. King, Mr. MARKEY, Mr.
MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN,
Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SAND-
ERS, Ms. SHAHBA, Mr. SMITH, Ms.
STABENOW, Ms. WARNEN, and Mr.
WYDEN):
S. 189. A bill to direct the Secretary of De-
fense to include in periodic health assess-
ments, separation history and physical ex-
aminations, and other assessments an eval-
uation of whether a member of the Armed
Forces has been exposed to toxic airborne
chemicals, and for other purposes; to the
Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KINZ (for himself, Mr. GARD-
NER, Mr. REED, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr.
BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROW, Mr. COONS,
Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DURBIN):
S. J. Res. 4. A joint resolution requiring the
advice and consent of the Senate or an Act 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.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr.
SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr.
BOOZMAN, Mr. Brown, Mr. CASEY, Mr.
COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCOWTH, Mrs.
GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN,
Mr. KAIN, Mr. King, Mr. MARKEY, Mr.
MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN,
Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SAND-
ERS, Ms. SHAHBA, Mr. SMITH, Ms.
STABENOW, Ms. WARNEN, and Mr.
WYDEN):
S. 190. A bill to amend the Foreign Assist-
ance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance to
nonprofits, foreign nongovernmental organi-
zations, and quasi-autonomous nongov-
ernmental organizations that promote or per-
form abortions; to the Committee on Foreign
Relations.
Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCAR, and Mr. RUBIO.

S. Res. 22. 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) and 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. 113

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 113, a bill to appropriate funds for pay and allowances of excepted Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. 131

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, 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 abortion services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 141, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

S. 159

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 159, a bill to imbedd 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. 160

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 160, 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 Mr. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SULLIVAN) from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) 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 85 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify that aliens excepted from deportation under this amendment are not 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 achieves 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 must maintain blue card status for the next 3 or 5 years, depending on the total hours worked in agriculture, and 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. 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 Protection Act provides a way and stability for our farmworkers that is necessary to keep the industry strong.

I would like to thank Representative LOPGREN in the House for working with me to introduce this legislation today in both chambers. I invite my colleagues in the Senate to co-sponsor 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 unilateral effort to 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, as the founder and signatory of Article 5 of the NATO Treaty, more than other member states, must firmly state opposition, use our muscle, and lead directly without action from Congress, he might just do so. For this reason, we must firmly state opposition, use our constitutional powers of advice and consent of the Senate to block any unilateral attempt to withdraw without the advice and consent of the Senate.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—EXpressing the Sense of the Senate That the Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance Policy Should Be Permanently Established

Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. Braun, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Wicker, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Blunt, Ms. Ernst, Mr. Daines, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Hawley, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Risch, Mr. Thune, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Scott of South Carolina, Mr. Moran, Mr. Lankford, Mrs. Fischer, and Mr. Enzi) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas section 104(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b(f)) (commonly referred to as the “Belgium Amendment”) states that no foreign assistance funds may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to counsel or coerce any person to have or to provide assistance for legal abortions; and

Whereas section 518 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1992 (Public Law 102-192, 102 Stat. 2302) (commonly referred to as the “Siiljander Amendment”) states that no foreign assistance funds may be used to pay for the performance of abortion or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning, regardless of the source of funding; and

Whereas, upon assuming office on January 20, 1989, President George H.W. Bush continued to enforce the Mexico City Policy as established by President Reagan; and

Whereas the Mexico City Policy was reestablished on January 22, 2001, by President George W. Bush; and

Whereas, on January 23, 2009, President Barack Obama rescinded the Mexico City Policy; and

Whereas, on January 23, 2017, President Donald J. Trump reestablished the Mexico City Policy and directed the Secretary of State to apply the policy to all Federal global health assistance; and

Whereas the Department of State modernized the Mexico City Policy on May 15, 2017, renamed ‘‘Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance,’’ to coordinate with health assistance provided abroad by a Federal agency, including the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should expeditiously consider statutory changes that permanently codify the Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance Policy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22—Condemning the Terrorist Attack in Nairobi, Kenya on January 15, 2019, and Offering Sympathy, Condolences, and Support to All of the Victims, Their Families and Friends, and the People of Kenya

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

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 Walk at the Park International Hotel 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 CHILD ABDUCTION AS PART OF EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE AWARENESS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mrs. Fein- stein, Mr. McConnel, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Risch, Mr. Booker, Mr. Crapo, 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 without the intent to obstruct the lawful exercise of parental rights;

Whereas more than 9,127 children experienced international parental child abduction between 2008 and 2015;

Whereas, during 2017, one or more cases of international parental child abduction in- volving children who are citizens of the United States were identified in 105 countries around the world;

Whereas the United States is a party to the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at the Hague, October 25, 1980 (TIAS 11670) (referred to in this preamble as the "Hague Convention on Abduction"), which—
(1) supports the prompt return of wrongly removed or retained children; and
(2) calls on all participating parties to respect parental custody rights;

Whereas the majority of children who were abducted from the United States have yet to be reunified with their custodial parents;

Whereas, during 2017, Argentina, the Bahama s, Brazil, China, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, India, Japan, Jordan, Morocco, Peru, and the United Arab Emirates were identified under the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention Act (22 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) as engaging in a pattern of noncompliance—

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that family abduc- tion—
(1) is a form of child abuse with potentially devastating consequences for a child, which may include the physical and mental well-being of the child;
and
(2) can cause a child to "experience a loss of community and stability, leading to loneliness, anger, and fear of abandonment";

Whereas, according to the 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by the Department of State, research shows that an abducted child is at risk of significant short- and long-term problems, including “anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, [and] aggressive behavior”;

Whereas international parental child abduction has devastating emotional consequences for the child and for the parent from whom the child is separated;

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; and
(2) in the Department of State, the Office of Children’s Issues of the Bureau of Consular Affairs;


Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Reso- lution 543, 112th Congress, on December 4, 2012, which—
(1) condemns international parental child abduction;
and
(2) urges countries identified by the Depart- ment of State as noncompliant with the Hague Convention on Abduction to fulfill the commitment those countries made to imple- ment 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 parent within the United States; and
(C) “where appropriate, seek the extra- dition of the parent that abducted the child”;

Whereas the Senate adopted Senate Reso- lution 431, 115th Congress, on April 19, 2018, which—
(1) raises awareness and promotes edu- cation about international parental child abduc- tion;
(2) recognizes the impacts on children who are victims of international parental abduc- tion; 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

(4) urge countries to comply with the re- quirements 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 Depart- ment of State received 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 4,401 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 Home- land Security, in coordination with the Pre- vention Branch of the Office of Children’s Issues of the Department of State, enrolled 210 children in a program aimed at pre- venting international parental child abduc- tion;

Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) recognizes and observes “Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month” during the period beginning on April 1, 2019, and ending on April 30, 2019, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction; and

(2) urges the United States to continue playing a leadership role in raising awareness about the devastating impacts of interna- tional parental child abduction by edu- cating the public about the negative emo- tional, psychological, and physical con- sequences 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. Bar- rasso, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Daines, Mr. Enzi, and Mr. Tester) submitted the following resolution; which was re- ferred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 24

Whereas land-based intercontinental bal- listic 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 Russian Federation 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 People’s Republic of China 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 forces;
Whereas numerous countries possess or are seeking to develop nuclear weapons capabilities that pose challenges to the nuclear deterrent 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 deterrent 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 targeting problem for a potential adversary;
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 ICBMs 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 attributes of ICBMs;
Whereas, in a 2014 analysis of alternatives, the Air Force concluded that replacing the Minuteman III missile would provide upgrading and at lower cost when compared with extending the service life of the Minuteman III missile; and
Whereas the Minuteman III replacement program for the ground-based strategic deterrent, is expected to provide a land-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 or delay 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 Graab, 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.

MEDICAID 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 today.

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 program, to extend protection for Medicaid 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.

(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:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
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 THE JUDICIARY
GREG GIRARD GUIDRY, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE KURT D. ENGELHARDT, ELEVATED.
JAMES WESLEY HENDRIX, 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 EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE RICHARD A. SCHELL, RETIRED.

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. ENGELHARDT, ELEVATED.
JAMES WESLEY HENDRIX, 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 EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE RICHARD A. SCHELL, RETIRED.
SEAN D. JORDAN, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE JOHN H. MCBRYDE, RETIRED.
PETER D. WRITIR, 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 Womenack 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.

HONORING SUPERINTENDENT MICHAEL WATKINS
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 member. 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 nest appreciation to Superintendent Watkins for his service to our community.

RECOGNIZING ALICJA EDWARDS OF EURAKEA
HON. GREG GIANFORTE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 17, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Alicja 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, Alicja’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, Alicja 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.

Alicja 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.”

Alicja is 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 Alicja 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.
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 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 Buehring, Kuwait and Camp Eureka, 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 conservative 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 Special Executive Counsel for the commission on water issues.

In 2006, Brad became a partner at the law office of Henson, Bowman, Smith, P.C., serving as senior managing director of government affairs. He was chosen as a James Magazine 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 Buehring, Kuwait and Camp Eureka, 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 conservative 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 Special Executive Counsel for the commission on water issues.

In 2006, Brad became a partner at the law office of Henson, Bowman, Smith, P.C., serving as senior managing director of 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 Wes ley 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.
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 protect 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 anti-Semitic 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 recognize the history and importance of our 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 teach the next generation to 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 and mobilizing a movement by example, 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 Reifeld. To those outside the movement, the love, concern and sympathy and my hope that they will take some comfort in knowing how many people loved and are inspired by Lynda.

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 spirit alive. They continue to fight for civil rights, nonviolence, and grassroots activism alive. Every year, they have demonstrated to our Desert community that the values Dr. King preached—justice, love, respect—are as important today as they were during his lifetime.

This committee was born from the vision and service of Mr. Joseph Beaver, a lifetime civil rights advocate and community leader. Answering the call to service during World War II, Mr. Beaver was one of the first African Americans to join the Marine Corps.

We are blessed by Mr. Beaver’s advocacy for social justice, which has inspired and enriched our valley. To this day, he remains on the frontlines fighting for civil rights here in our community. In 2014, it was 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 fought and endured continues. Inequity 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: to not 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. BLUMENAUER. 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 Inclusive Care for the Elderly (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 leaving 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 coach 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 taught them that hard work, 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 his 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 became 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 from the 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. Overall, 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 Hoosier 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 have to want 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 record vote on H.J. Res. 28 been recognized and called, I would have voted no.

HONORING THE HARRISBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR EARNING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION 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 neighborhood block parties and cookouts with officers. Out of nearly 800 nationwide law enforcement groups who held a National Night Out for the first time, the Harrisburg Police Department 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 selfless charge to protect and defend the people they serve.

I’ve long appreciated the commitment and self-sacrifice of our law enforcement professionals. On behalf of Pennsylvania’s Tenth Congressional District, I congratulate and extend my heartfelt thanks to the Harrisburg Police Department on this great accomplishment, 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 developed 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 place where the opportunity to achieve is so great, and where the rights of all are so well protected. Today, the Hon. Peter J. Visclosky, Madam Speaker, truly knows this country, and 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.


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, for the people.” They know 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 wherever 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 and offer my gratitude for his admirable contributions to his community.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Mr. Eddie Farris for his accomplishments, as well as his commitment to excellence, professionalism, innovation, service, and collaboration in the Walton County School 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. CLEYBURN and the House for acting against hate speech. Representative King has quietly 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 unapologetically 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

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR. 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 Strategic Air Command’s top missileers for Minuteman III training in Officer Training School, Mr. Coy has been selected as one of 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

SPEECH OF

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 I 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 Capitol 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 . . . the right to 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 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. Pages S292–94

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. Page S297

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. Page S297

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. Page S297

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. Pages S288–92

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. Page S288

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. Pages S297–98

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 Northern 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. Page S298

Messages from the House: Page S292

Measures Referred: Page S292

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Page S292

Executive Communications: Page S294

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S294–97

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Privileges of the Floor: Page S297

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—7) Page S288

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, 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 yea-and-nay vote of 422 yea 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 yea-and-nay vote of 362 yea 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. Page H701

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. Page 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. Page H712

Recess: The House recessed at 4:35 p.m. and reconvened at 4:42 p.m. Page H712

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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