



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2019

No. 19

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 30, 2019.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

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

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

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE FUTURE OF CONGRESS

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

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

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

of bipartisanship, and a crossroads of accomplishment.

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

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

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

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

God bless our great country of America.

RECOGNIZING HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

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

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

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

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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1287

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

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

PREVENTING THE NEXT SHUTDOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IS POSSIBLE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GUN SAFETY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FLOOD INSURANCE FOR FARMERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

JAMES ISLAND OCEAN ACTKIDVISTS

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

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

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

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

WASHINGTON IS BROKEN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0915

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ministration agents, you take away transportation security.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0930

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

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

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

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

The question is: Where do the dollars come from?

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

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

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

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

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

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

than that, and candidly, I think we will.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Shouldn't they all get a pay raise?

Don't all of them deserve a pay raise?

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

Why not?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So what are we doing today?

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

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

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

We want Democrats and Republicans.

But I said: We sure will.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That is qualitatively different service.

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

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

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

□ 0945

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1000

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

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

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

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—232

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

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

NAYS—190

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

Walorski	Wittman
Waltz	Womack
Watkins	Woodall
Weber (TX)	Wright
Webster (FL)	Yoho
Wenstrup	Young
Westerman	Zeldin
Williams	
Wilson (SC)	

NOT VOTING—10

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

□ 1030

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—231

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

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

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—12

Babin	Comer	Jones
Boat	Davis, Rodney	LaHood

Mullin
Payne

Schrader
Sensenbrenner

Shimkus
Wilson (FL)

□ 1039

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

FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORKFORCE
PAY RAISE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 87 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 790.

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

□ 1042

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. SABLAN in the chair.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Even though the Federal Government has reopened, most Federal employees

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

January 29, 2019.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,
National President.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY
EMPLOYEES UNION,
January 29, 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,

January 29, 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

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

SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION,
January 29, 2019.

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

Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

BILL VALDEZ,
President,
Senior Executives Association.

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

Hon. GERRY CONNOLLY,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

Thank you for your continued support of our federal workforce.

Sincerely,

RENEE JOHNSON,
National President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1115

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1130

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 2018]
FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SALARIES LAG BY AVERAGE OF 31 PERCENT, PAY GROUP REPORTS
(By Eric Yoder)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1145

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is categorically false.

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

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

We need to help the morale of the federal workforce.

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

We need to retain the talent that we have.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H.R. 790

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(f) **APPLICATION.**—

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-5. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. FLETCHER

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

□ 1200

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that the amendment can be adopted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. FLETCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 79

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

Operations at these agencies essentially came to a screeching halt:

Phone calls went unanswered as Federal workers were furloughed;

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

Food inspections at the FDA ceased;

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1215

The shutdown closed the immigration courts, contributing to an already

significant backlog of cases and delays in deportation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

difficult financial decisions for themselves and for their families.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have an opportunity to make it clear that shutting down the Government of the United States is not an acceptable strategy to resolve policy differences.

Mr. Speaker, after all they have been through, we owe assurances to the millions of Federal civilian workers, including the hundreds of thousands who were furloughed earlier this month, that Congress will ensure continued, uninterrupted operations of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, people at home think they are watching C-SPAN, but this is more like "Masterpiece Theatre." I mean, this is actually like a documentary where we record what happened in history, but here we see that we are going to change and revise history. We are going to remind everybody who is watching and everybody in this House that, under this minority leader, who was the majority leader at the time, we passed a bill in this House to keep the government open.

We didn't want to shut down the government. We wanted to keep the government open and fund border security. We passed it in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I know everybody is smiling over there because you voted against it, but we passed it in this House, and we sent it to the Senate. It was the Senate Democrats who said, "Oh, no. Oh, no, we are not going to do any of that border security stuff. We want you to go ahead and have the shutdown, and then we will blame it all on you."

Mr. Speaker, we are not here to revise history. We would like to get to the task at hand, which is solving this issue of border security.

We ask the other side, instead of engaging in this blame game, of which they are wholly part of, obviously—they didn't want to keep the government open. The Senate Democrats didn't want to do anything to keep the government open. Forget this charade, this theater, and let's get to negotiating on border security and making sure that the American people are safe.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to respond to that last speech.

A bill came from the Senate unanimously, Republicans and Democrats, that would have opened the govern-

ment. We would have voted for that bill, all of us, but after not moving on Department of Homeland Security for 11-23 of a year, the then-majority party added into that bill a piece of legislation they knew would not pass in the United States Senate. Democrats would not be for it. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman knew they wouldn't be for it, and the gentleman knew they couldn't get 60 votes. Notwithstanding that, they passed a piece of legislation that directly resulted in the shutdown of government.

I say that those are the facts.

As a matter of fact, we thought the President of the United States agreed with that bill, but somehow, in the some 900 feet of there to here, he changed his mind.

Maybe he talked to Ann Coulter or Sean Hannity. I don't know who the operative adviser was, but he changed his mind.

As a result, we had the longest shutdown in history.

The CBO says it cost at least \$11 billion. The economic adviser at the White House said that it was costing at least one-tenth of a point a week.

This resolution says: Shutdown is stupid.

I am sure some don't agree with that, because I have been in this Chamber when you have voted to keep the government shut down. And you don't like me saying that.

□ 1230

Your Speaker asked you to open up the government and 144 of you—your Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, not a Democrat, said: Look, this is stupid. We need to open up the government—voted no. Now, it passed because all of us voted with 87 Republicans, including your present leader, who voted yes to open up the government.

This resolution is so simple. A shutdown is stupid. That is all it says. We will see how you vote. And I am going to say something about some people who think it is stupid.

I want to thank my friend from Virginia, Ms. WEXTON, for her leadership on this issue. She represents a district, as I do, where there are many hard-working Federal employees, who were negatively affected.

We had an argument here about whether we ought to give people a 2.6 percent raise, a COLA adjustment, to keep them even with the economy. And we voted to give them nothing—zero, zip. Not a cost-of-living adjustment. No pay at all.

I see my friend, the minority leader, on the floor. He said, not paying 800,000 people was unacceptable. I agree with him. I think it is unacceptable. I think asking people to work and then not paying them is not a moral thing to do.

This resolution, as I said, is simple. It is one I believe nearly every Member of this House ought to support, unless you support shutting down the government of the United States of America.

It says, a shutdown should never be a strategy in negotiations over funding, period, full stop.

We just endured 35 days of a dangerous and unnecessary partial government shutdown that cost 800,000 American workers to be denied their paychecks and that the CBO says, as I just said, \$11 billion was the cost. Those are the direct costs.

Our resolution makes it clear that such a use of shutdowns, or the threat of shutdowns, ought not to be tolerated in our political system. Now, this resolution says that, but I am going to have some other people who are going to say that as well.

No other country has this phenomena. I can't find another country that shuts its government down. In Australia, if you shut the government down, the government falls, so you have to form a new government.

There is no reason why Americans should have to live under the threat of being taken hostage, yet again, the next time there is an unresolved debate over an issue, whatever the issue might be.

Even many Republican leaders agree that using a shutdown is wrong. I think most leaders, as a matter of fact, not everyone.

Senate Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL very definitively called shutdowns "a failed policy."

And Senator SUSAN COLLINS, rightfully, said, just a few days ago that: "Shutdowns represent the ultimate failure to govern and should never be used as a weapon"—let me repeat that—"and should never be used as a weapon to achieve an outcome."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues all know LAMAR ALEXANDER, the former Governor of Tennessee, former Secretary of Education, a Member of the United States Senate, and someone who was prominently mentioned and regularly mentioned as a candidate for President of the United States on the Republican ticket. Here is what he said: "It is always wrong for either side to use shutting down the government as a bargaining chip in budget negotiations."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to hear this, Senator ALEXANDER: "It should be as off-limits as chemical weapons are to warfare." Could Senator ALEXANDER have said it any more powerfully that shutdowns are not an option? That is all this resolution says.

Sadly, I think a lot of you are going to vote no, I suppose, on the theory that you think: No, if we don't get our way, shutting down the government is our option. That is certainly what you told Mr. BOEHNER and then Leader MCCARTHY.

This resolution says, let's not allow that to happen again. We now have 3 weeks to avert the next shutdown. I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will present us with a bipartisan agreement on how best to invest in border security. We all need to do our job.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join us on this resolution to make it clear to our Federal employees, to our contractors, to the American people, and, yes, to the rest of the world that we don't believe shutting down the government of the United States of America is an option in negotiations. Vote for this resolution. You know that shutting down government is not a positive result of our failures.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS). The gentleman from North Carolina has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, the comments that we just heard from the well, from the majority leader, fail to mention one critical point about this resolution.

This resolution doesn't do anything to stop a future shutdown. It is designed, in its purpose to give cover to a number on the other side of the aisle who voted in this very Chamber to not fund those who were deemed essential pay at a critical time. In fact, indeed, the very sponsor of this resolution voted against giving pay to those men and women who continue to show up to vote and now somehow are going to vote on a resolution and make it all okay. If we are going to have history, let's make sure it is accurate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, what is stupid is not securing the border.

Mr. Speaker, let's just cut to the chase. If Democrats would support now what they supported then, there never would have been a shutdown. Ten years ago, all kinds of Senators—Senators Biden, FEINSTEIN, SCHUMER, Obama, and Clinton—all supported money for a barrier on the border.

Senator Obama said this: "We simply cannot allow people to pour into the United States undetected, undocumented, and unchecked. Americans are right to demand better border security and better enforcement of our immigration laws."

Secretary Clinton said this: "I voted numerous times as a Senator to spend money to build a barrier to try to prevent illegal immigrants from coming in."

Oh, how times have changed.

Where are the Democrats today? What is the position of the left today? Congressman BLUMENAUER: Abolish ICE.

Candidate Clinton: We need a borderless hemisphere.

The Speaker of the United States House of Representatives said: Walls are immoral.

And the person they selected to give the State of the Union response, a gubernatorial candidate in Georgia, said she is okay with noncitizens voting.

Oh, how times have changed.

All we are asking for is, do what you said before, be for what you were for before, and let's build a border security wall.

Let's focus on one simple thing here. Let's do what is best for the country. Everyone knows a sovereign Nation should control its borders. Everyone knows that a border security wall will help with this caravan phenomena we have watched over the last several months. Let's build a border security wall. If we can agree on that—and Democrats were all for it just a couple of years ago—there never would have been a shutdown and we would be serving the American people.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. CLAY of Missouri, and a distinguished member of our committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people are listening to what is being said here on the floor, because they are actually getting an honest flavor of where some of my friends on the other side of the aisle actually are.

Everybody, Mr. JORDAN says, agrees we need a wall, a barrier on the border. Actually, not everybody does. Actually, most polls show most Americans don't support that, and that number is increasing: the opposition.

Federal workers make more than their private sector counterparts, despite the fact that the official study shows they are 31 percent behind their private sector counterparts, and there are differences because of the differences in the nature of the work.

What you are also hearing, besides Darwinian "survival of the fittest" rhetoric and Marie Antoinette, "let them eat cake" kind of rhetoric coming out of this administration and some Members of this body, which I think reflects poorly on an understanding about where the average American, including the average Federal employee, actually is and what their needs really are—and they don't demand much—but respect is something they do demand, and it is something we offer them. That is why this resolution in front of us is so important.

Is it that hard to come together? Yeah, it is nonbinding, but it is aspirational. And even that, apparently, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle find difficult to swallow: a commitment not to shut down government for any reason.

Mr. Speaker, let's not hold Federal employees, and the American public they serve, hostage ever again. We will deal with our policy disputes separately, but we won't engage in shutting down the Federal Government. It is disastrous, it is reckless, it is dysfunctional, and it is a disservice to the people who sent us here. It is that simple. Never again shut down government.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what is hard to respond to?

It is hard to respond to my constituents at home who are witnessing the theater of the absurd.

It is hard to respond to Laurie Vargas, a mother in San Antonio, who lost her son, Jared, last summer to somebody who was here illegally, who was captured and released, captured and released, stopped by law enforcement, and then murdered her son.

It is extremely hard to respond to our members of the Border Patrol, who go down to the river, the Rio Grande in Laredo, and are down there with no cell signal, have no radio, can't see the river through the cane, they are down there by themselves, they know the cartels have operational control of the border, they know their lives are threatened if they speak out about the cartels, they know that there are terrorists who are leading cartel organizations across the border in Nuevo Laredo, and we are doing nothing to give them what they need to defend the United States of America.

I can't go home to the people in Texas 21 and explain to them why we are here for 2 days having show votes and then leave on a Wednesday. Explain that. Explain to the people why we are going to leave this afternoon at 1:00 not securing the border.

It makes absolutely no sense to the American people when they watch what happens in this body, and they wonder how the people's House leaves them with an unsecured border and nothing more than show votes, like we are going to have today, for political theater.

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

□ 1245

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of the resolution, both of them, the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from North Carolina.

I thank Ms. WEXTON and Mr. CONNOLLY for capturing the essence of what this legislation is all about. It is not contentious. We don't intend to divide this House. We intend to unify this House.

But I think as we speak to our colleagues and the American people, it is clear that the opening sentence says that this body believes that shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation. That is a word that I think all of us can join on.

And if we look at the desperation of our Federal workers, 800,000—270,000 in Texas, 4,000 in my district—you see the opening line: "My landlord is calling and I must pay." And the follow-up is: "I have no money."

All that we are saying today is to affirm the value of our constituents,

from the Coast Guard to FBI, to Customs and Border Protection, Transportation Security, and Forest Service fighters who are on the front lines.

To my good friend from Texas, I can't count the times I have been to the border and seen barriers and fencing, but what I do know is, yes, SHEILA JACKSON LEE has voted over and over for border security here, years ago, and made the first crunch of dollars that dealt with increasing Border Patrol when they were barely in existence by providing laptops and providing the kind of vehicles that they needed and worked with landowners who didn't want any kind of fence, stone or otherwise, but to be able to give them the support.

Now we need smart border security, technology with drones, better infrastructure, more ports of entry. Today, we hope that will happen, because it will happen because appropriators are sitting down.

But can we reflect? This shutdown was in the midst of Christmas when we had bills that Republicans and Democrats had signed onto that came from the Senate. We could vote.

This is saying that whatever our policy differences are, you never hold a Federal worker, a person who is serving his or her Nation, hostage. You never make them desperate.

You never make them have to call a congressional office, "I am about to be evicted," as my constituent did. We never let them lose their house. We never let them bring their children out of school, as some had to do.

You never let them do as they are doing in my district right now, going to get groceries. And you never let them hear the words: "Go to a bank. I don't know why they just can't walk into a bank." Or someone else says: "It is okay. They are doing it for their Nation."

That is what this is about. It is simply allowing us to tell a reservist from the Middle East, Edith Banda, that she doesn't have to sell her belongings because she doesn't have a job because she is a Federal worker and she had been furloughed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution, and I ask them to stand for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Res. 79, which expresses the strong sense of Congress that government shutdowns are detrimental to the nation and should never occur again.

I am pleased to be an original co-sponsor of this important resolution that condemns the President's callous decision to shut down the federal government for 35 days, furloughing 800,000 civil servants and forcing nearly half that many to work without pay, and which costs the economy more than \$11 billion in lost productivity and economic output.

The collateral damage caused by the Trump Shutdown was substantial, long lasting, and unnecessary because it could have been avoided had the President not reneged on his promise to sign the continuing resolution passed by the Senate unanimously on December 19, 2018.

Because the President broke his promise, frontline federal employees, including law enforcement and public safety personnel, worked without pay from December 22 through January 25, 2019.

The way these federal workers, many of whom risk their lives in the service of this country, were treated was shameful.

This included around 14,000 FBI agents, 54,000 Customs and Border Protection agents, 47,000 Transportation Security Officers, and 6,000 Forest Service firefighters.

TSA employees received their last paycheck on December 28 and this single paycheck had to stretch much further than originally intended.

The shutdown forced some employees to look for new jobs or take on extra work, and the pressure was immense for employees and families with no other source of income.

Among those not receiving a pay check for their work were 3,200 Secret Service agents who risk their lives every single day to protect President Trump and his family.

Speaker PELOSI's decision to delay the State of the Union was in defense of the Secret Service agents who would be forced to work without pay.

In addition to the federal employees working without pay, hardworking federal employees at agencies like the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Agriculture, and NASA had been furloughed without pay, plunging them and their families into uncertainty.

These are real American families that were put through an unwarranted and unnecessary shutdown, and they suffered because of it.

Many federal employees were furloughed, and those deemed essential were expected to work without pay.

American families were stuck wondering how they were going to get by without an income, especially since things like rent, groceries, children's prescriptions and general day-to-day living costs must still be paid whether the government is fully functional or not.

The Trump Shutdown ended when the Speaker PELOSI made the President face reality that the vast majority of the American people and their representatives in Congress did not support wasting \$5.7 billion on an unnecessary and immoral wall that the President promised Mexico would pay for.

Not only were Americans struggling to pay for their day-to-day expenses but veterans and military families were suffering as well.

The military was also suffering in other areas.

For example, changes of station for military personnel were delayed and facility and weapons maintenance was suspended.

Military commissaries (base grocery stores) were shut down and military families were forced to shop elsewhere, costing up to 30 percent more on average than at the commissaries.

The United States Coast Guard went without funding for thirty-five days.

This was an added expense that added up very quickly, especially for military families living in cities with a high cost of living.

Edith Banda who recently returned from a reservist deployment in the Middle East was among thousands of people in the Houston area who felt impact of the government shutdown.

Edith was unable to work her federal job in downtown Houston for 35 days.

Making matters worse, she and dozens of others in Houston were unable to seek temporary private sector work because such jobs require permission, and the people who process those requests were also furloughed.

Edith had begun selling her personal possessions to make ends meet.

There are so many other issues that could be tackled with the money Trump wants to spend on the border wall.

With an increase of \$265 million the Department of Justice could hire 2,000 new police officers and make steps towards making many communities a safer place.

With an increase of \$99 million the Office of National Drug Control Policy could support community-level efforts to address substance abuse programs in nearly 730 additional communities.

With an increase of \$200 million the Economic Development Administration could create or preserve 31,000 jobs for our hardworking Americans.

With an additional \$20 million Small Business Administration grants could support dozens more Women's Business and Veterans Outreach Centers providing business training, counseling and outreach to 47,000 additional US veterans and women.

These are the changes that American citizens deserve.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 79 could not come at a better time.

Having survived the Trump Shutdown, it is fitting and proper for the House of Representatives to go on record and state that the shutdown of the Government of the United States, or any portion thereof, causes substantial damage to Federal employees, to every American who benefits directly or indirectly from Federal services, to our Nation's economy, and to the reputation of the United States around the world.

Mr. Speaker, shutting down the Government of the United States, or any portion thereof, is not an acceptable tactic or strategy for resolving differences regarding policy, funding levels, or governing philosophy.

Given the damage mercilessly inflicted on the American people and the economy by the Trump Shutdown, Congress has a fiduciary duty to the American people to ensure the continued, uninterrupted operations of the Government of the United States and its services.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H. Res. 79.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, in consultation with my friend opposite, we are going to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia and then recognize the Republican leader after that, and then I will be prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution talks about not having more government shutdowns. We don't need a resolution for that. Of course, there shouldn't be government shutdowns. That is why, last year, this body passed a resolution to fund government, including Trump's border wall that he asked for.

We passed that out of this Chamber. It went to the Senate. And what did

they do? Nothing. The Senate did nothing. They did nothing for over 30 days. They just sat while the government shut down.

Why? Because the minority party in the U.S. Senate chooses to threaten to filibuster, and if they don't get everything they want, based on this threat to filibuster, they shut down government until such time as this Chamber or the President or whoever they want to bully around gives them everything. That is not the way government is supposed to work.

I had a conversation yesterday with a young man here in D.C. He said: "How are you going to end these government shutdowns? What is going to happen now?"

Well, gosh, we have appointed a conference committee. That is how it is supposed to work. The Homeland Security conference committee meets today. There are four Republicans and three Democrats, which reflects the makeup of that Chamber. There are 10 from this Chamber, 6 Democrats and 4 Republicans, which reflects the makeup of this Chamber.

That is the committee where you meet and you work these things out. That is the system the Founders of our country set up for us here. The problem is we have gotten away from that. We do continuing resolutions like we shouldn't, and we sit here and one side has to get everything they want.

Why does it happen that way? Because one side, the Democratic side, wants to get everything they want. If they don't get everything they want, they want to shut down government and then falsely blame everybody else. That is not the way it is supposed to work.

I am glad we have a conference committee. My Senator from West Virginia SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO is actually on that conference committee that is supposed to meet today to work out exactly what we are going to do with the border wall and funding Homeland Security.

That is what we should do with every bill. That is why, last year, when we were in the majority, we actually passed the appropriations bills over to the U.S. Senate. Do you know what they did? Nothing.

It doesn't take 60 votes to pass a bill. It takes 60 votes to invoke cloture. That is different than passing a bill.

The dysfunction in the U.S. Senate cannot continue to reign in this country and cause government shutdowns, particularly when the minority party wants everything.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

We have dozens of people who are willing to speak, but in the interest of time, none more important than the Republican leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 79, a glorified press release that the majority is having this Chamber spend time on during another yet underwhelming legislative week.

At a time when the country expects its leaders in Washington to look forward, this House majority is looking backwards. When our country expects solutions, they are using this Chamber to settle political scores.

As hundreds of thousands of Americans painfully experienced, portions of our Federal Government were shut down for 35 days, a shameful record under this majority's watch. It was a shutdown that never had to happen.

Let's recall last December when this House passed an appropriations bill that would have funded the government, secured the border, and provided disaster assistance to the millions affected by hurricanes and fires. Most importantly, it was a bill that would have been signed into law. This occurred after then-Leader PELOSI declared in the Oval Office earlier that month that a House majority couldn't pass such a bill.

That legislation went to the Senate and, alas, Senator SCHUMER stopped it. And in doing so, once again, Senator SCHUMER shut this government down.

From the moment Senator SCHUMER blocked consideration of that appropriation bill, President Trump and congressional Republicans offered solution after solution after solution after solution to solve the challenge. In all, the President offered four reasonable solutions to end the shutdown and secure the border.

The Democrats never offered one. In fact, they went on vacation and political fundraisers to Puerto Rico. They littered this Chamber with messaging bills that didn't come close to solving the problem and would never be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the very last solution the President offered. I want to focus on it because it met the Democrats halfway. It was the truest form of compromise this town has seen in quite some time. It would have secured portions of the border with barriers, and it would have provided certainty to the very communities that my friends on the other side of the aisle have stood on this floor for countless hours to claim they want to help.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the actions of this majority when presented with that opportunity and following the shutdown tell you all you need to know about who they truly want to help.

Do you know who they want to help? Themselves.

After the President signed a 3-week continuing resolution, the Speaker gloated with a Presidential-style enrollment ceremony. Democrats marveled at her exercise of raw political motivation. Many in the media responded like they were beat reporters from their hometown team. This all sounds like a historic event.

What exactly was everyone celebrating? They were celebrating nothing. They were celebrating achieving nothing. They were celebrating the status quo that suits their political interest and personal pursuits of self-righteousness, a status quo that causes pain and suffering for Americans across this country.

Here are just a few examples:

There have been 266,000 criminal aliens arrested in the last 2 years. This includes charges and convictions of 100,000 assaults, nearly 30,000 sex crimes, and 4,000 violent killings.

Three hundred Americans die every week from heroin, and more than 90 percent of heroin comes from across the southern border.

Roughly 10,000 children are being smuggled into the U.S. every year to be sold for human trafficking.

They are celebrating a status quo that leaves 700,000 DACA-designated individuals unsure about their future.

It was the best display of politics that this country is sick and tired of seeing: zero-sum politics and nothing ever changes.

I would like to spend some time and reflect on Americans and their families who may not have been celebrating the status quo preserved by this majority:

Jerry David;
 Sherri David;
 Deputy Josie Greathouse Fox;
 Pierce Corcoran;
 Officer Ronil Singh;
 Clinton Howell;
 Robert Page;
 Justin Lee;
 Ellie Bryant;
 Grayson Hacking;
 Dominic Durden;
 Edwin Jackson;
 Grant Ronnebeck;
 Kenneth Scott Mahr;
 Officer Kevin Will;
 Sergeant Brandon Mendoza;
 Sergeant Cory Wride;
 Josh Wilkerson;
 Spencer Golvach;
 Kate Steinle;
 Detective Michael Davis;
 Deputy Danny Oliver;
 Bob Barry;
 Parker Moore;
 Officer Andy Chavez;
 Lauren Bump;
 Louise Sollowin;
 Serenity Reedy;
 Vanessa Pham;
 Kathleen Byham;
 Agent Brian Terry;
 Officer Henry Canales;
 Donald Mayle;
 Breanna Schneller;
 Jennifer Lee Hampton;
 Officer Andrew Widman;
 Officer Rodney Johnson;
 Buddy Mason;
 Adrienne Shelly;
 Mollie Tibbetts;
 Ronald da Silva;
 Sarah Root;
 Drew Rosenberg;
 Kara Willingham;
 Oscar Navarro;

Margaret Kostelnik;
Andres Duran;
Rocky Jones; and
Michael Grubbs.

These are just 50 names of Americans whose lives have been lost to illegal immigration. They no longer have their voice, but we can and must be their voice today. And if these names sound familiar, it is because we heard them on the news.

I would like to reflect on others who certainly weren't celebrating the status quo.

□ 1300

The names may sound familiar because these are the same individuals who then-Leader PELOSI set a record on this floor just a year ago in February for more than 8 hours defending the passion of DACA and shutting the government down: Vanessa Rodriguez; Ana Sanchez; Juan Escalante; Cesar Vargas; Nicole Robles; Jacqueline Romo; Andrea Sibra; Cesar Espinoza; Denise Rojas; Ray Pineta; Kelly; Crystal; Carlos; Marian; Brittany; Hugo; Fernando; Javier Noras; Marco Dorado; Mayra; Fernanda Herrera; Emily; Claudia; Bruna; Cynthia Sanchez; Jose Castillo; Hugo Alexander Acosta; Denia Candela; Luis Galvin; Hector Rivera Suarez; Dalia Medina; Juan Carlos Navarro; Patricia Yulowa; Maria Praley; Jose Manuel Santobo; Carlos Emilio Diaz; Luis Roberto Ucerra; Sofia De La Varga; Novella Vladimar; Gloria Ricconi; Alonzo Rivarola; Yuri Hernandez; Oscar Canajoe, Jr.; Ashley Lamadrid; Gladys Clompka; Denaya Joseph; Miriam Ochoa Garbay; Han Yoon Li.

Mr. Speaker, as this House adjourns for the week today—after just one rule bill—I implore my colleagues to take some time and think deeply about these individuals, their families, and what our country stands for. It certainly isn't this political stunt by this majority, and it certainly isn't the status quo they are so proud to protect.

As Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we are a very small group with a very large responsibility. The burden on us 435 Americans is to represent 325 million Americans faithfully and to work together so tomorrow is better than today. Let us not let these political distractions get in the way of our duty. Instead, let's actually work together to give a voice to the voiceless.

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

Mr. Speaker, these are powerful words by our Republican leader. There has been a lot of debate. I don't think a more somber moment have I experienced this week on the House floor than when the 50 names were read out, where their loved ones will never be able to welcome them home. There will be ball games that are missed. There will be calls that are no longer made of, "Welcome home, Daddy," or "welcome home" to a son or a daughter.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about the pain and anguish of Federal

employees. Indeed, there are real hardships there that are undeniable. But, Mr. Speaker, they are getting their pay back. For the lives of the 50 people who were just named on this House floor, there is no returning. Their lives were extinguished, Mr. Speaker, and we must do something about that as well.

I am committed to my colleagues opposite to work with them to protect Federal workers, as long as they are willing to work with us to protect the communities and the safety of moms and dads from coast to coast.

On that, it is important that we have no more show votes. This resolution is meaningless other than to provide cover for some on the other side of the aisle who voted against giving pay to those who were essential employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me thank all of the body for engaging in this debate and for the minority leader bringing forth those names. But let me say that H. Res. 79 is not about the undocumented, nor is it a political stunt. It is not messaging for some political purpose. This resolution is about compassion and respect for fellow Americans who happen to be Federal workers who deserve to stay on the job and deserve to get a paycheck, and for the work and the service that they give to the rest of the country.

My friends on the other side know better. They know better, that shutdowns are harmful to our economy as well as our national security. They know that. The Federal Government should always be open for business, and Federal employees should not be held as hostages.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a favorable vote on the passage of H. Res. 79, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 79, a resolution expressing the sense of the House that shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur.

And as a Member of the Appropriations Committee, I know firsthand how terrible this shutdown has been. This past weekend I met with Coast Guard families impacted by the 35-day government shutdown.

Families told me they were skipping medications and couldn't afford to put gas in the car because of the shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, these families did nothing wrong.

In fact, they have gone Above and Beyond the call of duty by signing up to serve in the Coast Guard.

And how did President Trump reward their sacrifices?

By inflicting a needless, 35-day government shutdown on these families. By using these families as political pawns.

Let me be clear: these Coast Guard families deserve far better than this. And so do all our federal workers—who bore the brunt of this shutdown through no fault of their own.

The CBO estimates that this shutdown cost our economy 11 billion dollars—including 3 billion dollars that will never be recovered.

It also caused immeasurable fear and anxiety for families.

So, while we can never fully repair the damage that was caused by this dangerous, irresponsible shutdown, I hope that President Trump and Congressional Republicans will take these stories to heart and learn from the damage they caused.

Simply put, families can't afford another shutdown.

So, let's pass this resolution and get back to work for the American people. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 79, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORKFORCE PAY RAISE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 87 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 790.

Will the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1306

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. SABLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-5 offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-5 offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 183, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—243

Adams	Golden	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gomez	Omar
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Axne	Gottheimer	Panetta
Barragán	Green (TX)	Pappas
Bass	Grijalva	Pascrell
Beatty	Haaland	Perlmutter
Bera	Harder (CA)	Peters
Beyer	Hastings	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Phillips
Blumenauer	Heck	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Plaskett
Bonamici	Hill (CA)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Porter
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Pressley
Brindisi	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Raskin
Bustos	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Hurd (TX)	Richmond
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Case	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sablan
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Sánchez
Ciulline	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cisneros	Kildee	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Cleaver	Kinzinger	Schrader
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Cole	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Connolly	Lamb	Serrano
Cook	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Shalala
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lawrence	Sherrill
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Craig	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)
Crist	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Crow	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cuellar	Lewis	Spanberger
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Cunningham	Lipinski	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Loeb sack	Staubert
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Dean	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luján	Takano
DeGette	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Malinowski	Titus
Delgado	Maloney,	Tlaib
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Matsui	Torres Small
Dingell	McAdams	(NM)
Doggett	McBath	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Trone
F.	McEachin	Underwood
Engel	McGovern	Van Drew
Escobar	McNerney	Vargas
Eshoo	Meeks	Veasey
Españillat	Meng	Vela
Evans	Moore	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Morelle	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Wasserman
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell	Schultz
Foster	Murphy	Waters
Frankel	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Napolitano	Welch
Gabbard	Neal	Wexton
Gallego	Neguse	Wild
Garamendi	Norcross	Wittman
Garcia (IL)	Norton	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	O'Halleran	

NOES—183

Abraham	Arrington	Barr
Aderholt	Babin	Bergman
Allen	Bacon	Biggs
Amash	Baird	Bilirakis
Amodi	Balderson	Bishop (UT)
Armstrong	Banks	Brady

Brooks (AL)	Harris	Ratcliffe
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Reed
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Reschenthaler
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Riggleman
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Burchett	Hill (AR)	Rodgers (WA)
Burgess	Holding	Roe, David P.
Byrne	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Rose, John W.
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Cloud	Jordan	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Katko	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Curtis	King (NY)	Smucker
Davidson (OH)	Kustoff (TN)	Spano
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	LaMort	Steil
Duffy	Lamborn	Steube
Duncan	Latta	Stewart
Dunn	Lesko	Stivers
Emmer	Long	Taylor
Estes	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Ferguson	Lucas	Thornberry
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Flores	Marchant	Tipton
Fortenberry	Marshall	Turner
Foxo (NC)	Massie	Turner
Fulcher	Mast	Upton
Gaetz	McCarthy	Wagner
Gallagher	McCaul	Walberg
Gianforte	McClintock	Walden
Gibbs	McHenry	Walker
Gohmert	McKinley	Walorski
Gonzalez (OH)	Meadows	Waltz
González-Colón	Meuser	Watkins
(PR)	Miller	Weber (TX)
Gooden	Mitchell	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Granger	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Williams
Graves (LA)	Norman	Wilson (SC)
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Womack
Green (TN)	Olson	Woodall
Griffith	Palazzo	Wright
Grothman	Palmer	Yoho
Guest	Pence	Young
Guthrie	Perry	Zeldin
Hagedorn	Posey	

NOT VOTING—12

Bost	LaHood	San Nicolas
Comer	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Payne	Shimkus
Jones	Radewagen	Wilson (FL)

□ 1334

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. CLYBURN, COOK, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, VISCLOSKEY, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SABLAN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 87, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amend-

ments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Brooks of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 790 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON PAY ADJUSTMENT FOR EMPLOYEES DISCIPLINED FOR SEXUAL MISCONDUCT.

During calendar year 2019, no increase in pay as authorized under this Act may be provided to any Federal employee who has been disciplined for sexual misconduct under chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit amends the Democratic bill by prohibiting taxpayer dollars from being used to give raises to Federal employees who have been disciplined for sexual misconduct. Without this change, Federal employees who have engaged in sexual misconduct in the workplace would be rewarded for their bad actions.

The Republican motion to recommit amends the bill and reports it back forthwith with an amendment. If it passes, the Republican motion to recommit will allow an immediate vote on final passage of the bill.

The underlying premise of the Democratic bill is that our Federal civilian workforce should be treated the same as members of our armed services, who received a 2.6 percent pay raise in last year's NDAA.

The Federal Government is blessed with amazing Federal employees. As a former United States attorney, I led an office of those amazing Federal employees. I worked with countless other dedicated Federal employees.

Our dedicated civil servants work day in and day out to protect and serve the American public. We are most grateful for their service.

The vast majority of Federal employees are hardworking. They don't engage in conduct unbecoming their civil

service. However, those who have been disciplined for sexual misconduct should not be rewarded with a 2.6 per cent pay increase.

The bill before the House today treats every Federal employee the same. Good, bad, competent, or not, they all get a pay raise on top of automatic step increases and promotions.

Earlier today, my colleagues have asked: Doesn't everyone deserve a pay raise? The answer is no. A broken disciplinary process in our Federal agencies make it nearly impossible to fire anyone. This Democratic bill is nothing short of a handout to individuals who engage in sexual misconduct in the workplace, and that is wrong.

How can we reward anyone who harms Federal employees in this manner? How can we reward people who abuse the public's trust in this way?

Let me give you a few past examples.

A 2018 PBS report included interviews with 34 current and former female U.S. Forest Service employees who alleged discrimination, harassment, and sexual assault at the agency. Do these employees who perpetrated this type of behavior deserve automatic raises? No.

In 2017, an NBC affiliate identified almost 100 cases of Federal employees viewing pornography on government computers. Should these employees be rewarded for this behavior with automatic pay raises? No.

In 2015, DOJ's Office of Inspector General found that DEA agents participated in sex parties in Colombia involving strippers and prostitutes paid for by drug cartels. Does this type of conduct warrant automatic pay raises? I don't think so.

A recent study—and this is horrible—shows that sexual harassment is commonplace in Federal offices. One in five women have experienced harassment in the workplace, and nearly 9 percent of male employees report the same. It took 7 years for a former trial lawyer from the Justice Department to win a ruling from the EEOC confirming she was harassed by two male supervisors.

In 2018, five ICE officials told The Washington Post the agency hadn't yet responded to sexual harassment claims they filed more than a year ago against a manager who they said pressured them to view nude photos.

Our disciplinary process is confidential and murky. It varies agency by agency. We don't know how many employees have been disciplined for sexual misconduct and still remain on the job. We have serious faults we must address before we give across-the-board pay raises.

During consideration of this bill in Rules, there was bipartisan sentiment to look at longstanding issues that face our civil servants. Retention, private-sector wage comparison, and millennial recruitment were some of those issues. But this was a hastily drafted bill, and this is not how the process should work.

□ 1345

The American people deserve a Federal workforce with high standards for appropriate conduct. Federal employees should feel safe and protected doing the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, we have problems in our Federal workforce that we must deal with before we give across-the-board pay raises.

The Republican motion to recommit protects due process rights of all Federal employees by ensuring that only those substantiated claims for which an employee has been disciplined will result in an employee being ineligible for a pay raise.

It is inexcusable that the Democrat bill, as drafted, would treat victims of sexual harassment the same as the perpetrators who may still be drawing Federal paychecks. Taxpayer dollars should not be used to give a pay raise to these bad actors.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit; and if it fails, I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the slander we have just heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have rarely heard such cynicism on the floor of the House of Representatives. Oh, no. My friends on the other side are right to kind of cabal because there is so much cynicism; but this one takes the cake.

We are here to honor the Federal workforce, not slander them with insinuation.

To listen to the gentlewoman from Indiana, one might infer that the Federal Government is riddled with people who are guilty of all kinds of nasty, near crimes and offenses, and should not be rewarded for it.

I wonder if we would use the same standard ourselves here in the House of Representatives. How many in the last Congress, especially on a particular side of the aisle, have resigned over sexual harassment charges? And that wasn't insinuation, that was real. So let's not have a double standard.

And by the way, I say to my friends, especially on this side of the aisle, let us not be distracted by what is really going on.

We are simply trying, after the worst shutdown in American history, to say to our own employees, 2.1 million: "You are valued. You are respected."

To actually vote for this is not only to say the opposite and deny them a simple cost of living increase that we have already given the military; it is, in fact, to say: By the way, we buy into this cynicism. We think you are riddled with guilt by association and insinuation.

So we have an opportunity, in defeating this MTR, one of the most cynical

I have ever heard, to actually make a positive statement to our Federal employees.

Stand up and be heard. Say "no" to shutdowns. Say "yes" to our Federal employees, and restore their sense of respect with our dignity.

Defeat this MTR.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered;

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 79; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 216, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—206

Abraham	Emmer	Kelly (MS)
Aderholt	Estes	Kelly (PA)
Allen	Ferguson	Kim
Amodei	Finkenauer	King (IA)
Armstrong	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Arrington	Fleischmann	Kinzinger
Axne	Flores	Kustoff (TN)
Babin	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Bacon	Foxx (NC)	Lamborn
Baird	Fulcher	Latta
Balderson	Gaetz	Lesko
Banks	Gallagher	Long
Barr	Gianforte	Loudermilk
Bergman	Gibbs	Lucas
Biggs	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Billirakis	Gonzalez (OH)	Luria
Bishop (UT)	Gooden	Marchant
Brady	Gosar	Marshall
Brindisi	Gottheimer	Massie
Brooks (AL)	Granger	Mast
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	McAdams
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Buck	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Bucshon	Green (TN)	McClintock
Budd	Griffith	McHenry
Burchett	Grothman	McKinley
Burgess	Guest	Meadows
Byrne	Guthrie	Meuser
Calvert	Hagedorn	Miller
Carter (GA)	Harris	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Chabot	Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)
Cheney	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Cline	Hice (GA)	Norman
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Nunes
Cole	Hill (AR)	O'Halleran
Collins (GA)	Holding	Olson
Collins (NY)	Hollingsworth	Palazzo
Conaway	Horn, Kendra S.	Palmer
Cook	Houlahan	Pence
Crawford	Hudson	Perry
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Porter
Cunningham	Hunter	Posey
Curtis	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe
Davidson (OH)	Johnson (LA)	Reed
Delgado	Johnson (OH)	Reschenthaler
DesJarlais	Johnson (SD)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Riggleman
Duffy	Joyce (OH)	Roby
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Rodgers (WA)
Dunn	Katko	Roe, David P.

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano

Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Comer
Davis, Rodney
Jones
LaHood
Mullin
Payne
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Wilson (FL)

□ 1359

Mr. CÁRDENAS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ROUDA changed his vote from “present” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 161, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—259

NAYS—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse

Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Kishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawsone (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse

Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez

Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speler
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Weston
Wild
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOES—161

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodeli
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Brady
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho

NOT VOTING—12

Bost
Comer
Davis, Rodney
Hill (CA)

Jones
LaHood
Mullin
Payne

□ 1408

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, if I would have been here, I would have voted yes.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, if I would have been here, I would have voted yes.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS ARE DETRIMENTAL TO NATION AND SHOULD NOT OCCUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 79) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Government shutdowns are detrimental to the Nation and should not occur, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 163, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]
YEAS—249

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)

Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer

Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum

McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)

Richmond
Riggleman
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil

Stevens
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wittman
Yarmuth

Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)

□ 1419

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, January 30, I missed a vote on H. Res. 79. Had I been present for the vote on H. Res. 79, I would have voted “no.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

NAYS—163

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Jayapal
Jeffries
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moelenaar
Mooney (WV)

Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Grothman
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—20

Blunt Rochester
Bost
Collins (GA)
Comer
Davis, Rodney
Emmer
Harder (CA)
Jones
LaHood
Long
Mullin
Payne
Raskin
Ruppersberger

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business following 1 minutes. The House will recess to allow for a security sweep of the House Chamber prior to the President's State of the Union Address. The House will meet again at approximately 8:35 p.m. in a joint session with the Senate for the purpose of receiving an address from the President of the United States. Members are advised that there will be no votes in the House on Tuesday.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, Madam Speaker, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of those suspensions will be announced by close of business Friday.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 840, the Veterans' Access to Child Care Act, introduced by Representatives BROWNLEY and HIGGINS. This bill would make permanent the VA's childcare pilot program and expand it so that veterans across the Nation who are parents or grandparents have a convenient, cost-free option for childcare when they have VA medical appointments.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as it relates to the suspension calendar, I know, this week, there was an extra bill added to the suspension calendar that wasn't on the list by close of business last week. Do you anticipate this Friday's list being amended again the following week, or should that be a complete list?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as I pointed out, additional items are possible to be added. We said that last week. We did add one. It was noticed on Monday, and we voted on it today. In effect, we met the 3-day rule, not the 72-hour rule, but that was a suspension. There may be others that we will add.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, clearly, as a suspension, it wasn't in the traditional sense—obviously, it went down. There being a sense of the House resolution, typically, those are resolutions where both sides work together.

I ask the gentleman, do they anticipate approaching senses of the House in a partisan way or, hopefully, in a bipartisan way, where we can work together to get a true sense of the House that could pass?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we want to move on a bipartisan basis. The good news was that this resolution, although it failed to have a two-thirds vote, did have a bipartisan vote with more than 20 Republicans voting for it, which I appreciate. Of course, the balance voted against the resolution, which said that shutdowns were bad.

But we will certainly try to give as much notice as possible to the gentleman and to his party.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, as we approach bipartisan resolutions, we hope that the gentleman from Maryland and his side would work with us on those. It could have been a resolution that actually passed, had we been able to work together and, hopefully, include some language about border security.

As we look to the conference committee that is now meeting, as we talk about border security especially being the centerpiece of the big debate over government funding that, hopefully, we get agreement to, there were reports that, last week, the Democrat majority was going to roll out their plan for homeland security. Ultimately, that plan wasn't, in fact, rolled out. Is there going to be a rollout? As we have these negotiations—

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland to let him know that his side said they wouldn't negotiate during a shutdown. Obviously, the shutdown is over now. Will there be a counteroffer now put on the table?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the conference com-

mittee has either met or is meeting. It is my understanding that Chairwoman LOWEY is going to have a press conference after the first initial meeting, so that we are in a conference. That is good news. I am sure the conferees are going to talk about proposals that they have to reach border security.

I might say that, although it appears to be the central part, in terms of our perspective, a shutdown is not about border security or any other particular issue. It is that it is a bad policy to shut down the Government of the United States. Notwithstanding that, I expect that Chairwoman LOWEY will be explaining our position in the conference.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I look forward to hearing that proposal laid out. As the House and Senate Republican and Democrat conferees meet together, I do think, and have an optimistic approach, that we are not that far removed from reaching a deal, if we can ultimately find a way to put a real amount on the table that shows how we can secure the border, as our experts—the men and women who risk their lives to secure the border—have suggested in their proposal, if we can come to a place where we can agree on a way to actually achieve border security, and that includes physical barriers.

When the gentleman from Maryland, I think it was 2 weeks ago, was talking about some Democrats who were going over to the White House back then, it was said that they didn't have the authority to negotiate. Do the Democrat conferees have the authority to negotiate on behalf of the Democrat majority in the House?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Certainly.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's quick candor.

Madam Speaker, as we wrap this up, I would ask about an issue that a number of our Members were concerned about and hope this is not a trend. In the House Natural Resources Committee, the majority, yesterday, as they were proposing their new rules for the committee—and each committee, as we know, proposes their new rules as a new Congress is sworn in and established on a committee level—in the oath that is administered to men and women who come before the committee to testify, the original proposal suggested removing “so help you God” from the oath. One of the Members on our side noticed that omission and put an amendment in place to restore “so help you God” in the oath. Fortunately, that was added back in.

I would ask the gentleman, is this going to be a trend? Is there going to be some kind of general movement by committees to try to remove “so help you God” from the oaths that are administered to witnesses?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, not as far as I know.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, hopefully, it is not a trend that we see.

Madam Speaker, I know the last few weeks have been contentious. We have a lot at stake as we try to get an agreement on something that actually can work to properly fund the government and properly secure the border.

I am glad that the conferees are finally meeting. I hope we don't see any attempt to run out the clock, because we do have a limited amount of time, although it is far more than enough time to reach an agreement, if all parties are truly there in earnest, and I do think they are.

I hope that they put all options on the table and listen to all the proper expert testimony that has been given on why we need to have certain amounts to secure the border and certain tactics and techniques and technology that are all going to be part of this.

Hopefully, at the end of that discussion, very quickly, they can reach an agreement that we can then bring to the House and the Senate and pass in a bipartisan way that the President can sign to finally properly fund the government and secure our Nation's border.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1430

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I share the gentleman's view. I hope the conferees can reach an agreement that will be agreeable to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, both the House and the Senate, and the President.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I know we look forward to welcoming the President of the United States to this House Chamber on Tuesday night for the State of the Union Address.

I appreciate the work that we are going to do together to secure our Nation's border and properly fund our government, and unless the gentleman has something else he would like to add, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 2019, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2019; HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, February 4, 2019; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, February 5, 2019, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR.
JAMES HAROLD BOWLES

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life of Dr. James Harold Bowles. Dr. Bowles was born in June 1921, and raised on the Pea Ridge in Goochland County, Virginia.

Dr. Bowles served in the U.S. Army and graduated from Virginia Union University before attending medical school and returning home to Goochland to open his medical practice. As he began his career serving his patients, Dr. Bowles continued his service as the first African American to serve on the Goochland County Board of Supervisors where he worked to strengthen our community for 32 years.

He was a lifetime member of the NAACP, a trustee of Emmaus Baptist Church, and an active member of community organizations across central Virginia. Above all, he was a beloved husband, father, brother, uncle, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He left an indelible mark on our community.

Madam Speaker, I leave you with the advice Dr. Bowles frequently gave. May it guide our work here in this Chamber.

SMILE. S, seek to understand before being understood; M, make others feel important; I, it is not about me; L, listen twice as much as you speak; E, emphatically, enthusiastically, and quickly admit it when you are wrong.

When you do this, dialogue can be easily achieved.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF
WILLIAM R. CARTEAUX

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of a great Hoosier, William R. Carteaux, the President and CEO of the Plastics Industry Association, and a dedicated supporter of the U.S. plastics industry which employs nearly 1 million Americans.

Mr. Carteaux passed away on December 10, 2018, after bravely fighting leukemia. Having worked with Bill, his passion for the U.S. plastics industry, which employs more than 50,000 Hoosiers and more than 10,000 in my district alone, was unmatched.

Bill pushed the entire industry to focus on recycling and sustainability, bringing together industry leaders and innovators to find effective market-based solutions to our environmental challenges.

Bill was first diagnosed with leukemia in 2016, and he set out to beat the disease for himself and others. He eventually chaired the Washington area Leukemia & Lymphoma Society

and raised hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The U.S. plastics industry is stronger today because of Bill's efforts, and he will be sorely missed.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Daniele, and his two daughters, as we honor his legacy and impact here in the House today.

RECOGNIZING NEW MEXICO ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPORTED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DURING THE SHUTDOWN

(Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the food banks and organizations across New Mexico that supported Federal employees, contractors, and their families during the shutdown.

I especially want to thank Arlene Murillo and the Border Patrol Agent Family Network in Sunland Park, New Mexico. It was an honor to witness their collaborative work, to feed their neighbors who were affected by the shutdown, or otherwise fighting hunger for other reasons.

New Mexicans were among the hardest hit when the government stopped paying its bills, but these organizations showed what it is to be New Mexicans, and embody the value to always have your neighbor's back.

Now that the damage and disruption of the shutdown is over, we as a Congress have a responsibility to ensure it never happens again. That is why I joined fellow freshman and signed on to the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns Act yesterday, to keep hardworking Americans from paying the price for Washington's brokenness.

Madam Speaker, I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FIRE
CHIEF JOHN WEAVER

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor one of Lancaster County's most honored public servants and a true hero, former Denver Fire Company Chief, John Weaver, who passed away on January 26.

John served our community for 50 years. He became a junior fireman when he was just 14 years old. He later joined the Denver Fire Company when he was 18, in 1969.

He held every officer position, including fire chief. He became a fire instructor, and most recently, he was one of the primary drivers for the fire department. He was a brave man who helped make the fire department what it is today.

John was also an entrepreneur who founded a manufacturing company,

Weaver Industries. Beyond working for the fire company and saving lives there, John was also involved in our community. He believed in giving back and serving others.

He served on the Cocalico School Board for 12 years, and coached golf and bowling. John found great joy in helping people and set a wonderful example for all of us.

He leaves behind a wife, three sons, and four grandchildren. May we remember his giving spirit and may he rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JACK
SHIFREL

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to honor the life of Jack Shifrel, a distinguished Army veteran, former Broward County Public Schools school board member, fierce veterans' advocate, and most importantly, my friend for 30 years.

Mr. Shifrel served as president of the Broward Veterans Coalition and was always on the front lines in responding to the critical needs of our community. He worked tirelessly to make sure the men and women who served our Nation maintained their dignity and well-being.

Jack was an indomitable civic force and had a lifelong passion for politics, serving 10 4-year terms as a Democratic Party committeeman in Broward County.

He was a passionate advocate for the underserved, a defender of civil rights, and someone who helped make Broward County a kinder, more compassionate community.

He was a dear friend and embodied the best of what it means to give back to your country and your community.

Although Jack is no longer with us, his legacy lives on through veterans that he served with, and the countless individuals whose lives he changed for the better.

Jack Shifrel was one of a kind, a selfless, compassionate, and tireless advocate for others in Broward County. He was a patriot in the truest sense, and will be profoundly missed, but never forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE
OF SCHOOL CHOICE

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of school choice. Last week was National School Choice Week when individuals from all over the country gathered to raise awareness of different education options available to parents and their kids.

In my home State of Florida, we are blessed to have access to traditional public schools, charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, online learning, and home schooling. These diverse programs provide kids with different opportunities to excel in the learning environment that works best for them.

I think specifically of Hunter Frost, a young man with autism who I have gotten to know very well. Hunter attended Pepin Academies, a tuition-free charter school in our district that specializes in teaching students with learning and learning-related disabilities.

Hunter thrived at Pepin Academies, graduating third in his class. He went on to receive his associate's degree from Hillsborough Community College with an A average and has been accepted by my alma mater, the University of South Florida, where he plans to begin this fall.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have Hunter as an intern in my office, and I look forward to his success and to seeing him excel in college and beyond.

SOLIDARITY IN SALARY

(Mr. ROSE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Solidarity in Salary Act, which would withhold paychecks from Members of Congress, the President, and the Vice President during a shutdown.

Everyone right now is trying to figure out who won the shutdown and who lost it. Well, here is the deal: Nobody won this thing, but the American people lost. We failed them. We turned our back on them, and they suffered.

Keeping the government open and running is our most basic responsibility. It is what our constituents ask of us. In just 3 weeks we managed to make them question whether Members of Congress were born without common sense, or whether we just get a frontal lobotomy after we are sworn in. And what did we get out of putting them through this misery? Nothing.

All that happened is we arrived at the same basic truth that we knew 5 weeks ago: that we had a deal. In these Halls we love to kiss up to vets, and cops, and firemen. All we do is thank them for their service, and rightfully so, because they put it all on the line each and every day.

But it is time that we actually try to emulate their service here. Because what they do, what they have to endure is that when they fail at their job, people die. People get hurt, and they have to live with that for the rest of their lives.

All this bill is talking about is us having skin in the game and not getting paid. We, as Members of Congress, should be feeling the same pain that we just inflicted on the American people.

SHUTDOWN TO END ALL SHUTDOWNS

(Mrs. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I came to Washington to work across the aisle and create economic opportunities for Minnesota families.

Since I have gotten here, I have regularly met with Democrats and Republicans to discuss the issues so many Americans talk about around the kitchen table: better schools for their children, a fair shot at economic security for their family, and healthcare they can afford.

We have also discussed over the last several weeks the shutdown. This must never happen again. Yesterday, I joined many of my colleagues, freshman colleagues, to introduce a bill to prevent another shutdown, the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns Act.

This would prevent Federal workers from being used as pawns in future political negotiations. Our bill creates strong incentives to prevent another shutdown from occurring by withholding pay from Members of Congress and the executive branch, while forcing lawmakers to remain in Washington until a deal is reached.

Additionally, the bill ensures that the government will continue running, even if we can't get to an appropriations bill.

Americans deserve better. We can do better for them. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns Act and take a stand to never put politics over the American people again.

VIETNAMESE LOC HUNG GARDEN EVICTION

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to bring attention to the Vietnamese Government's violence and oppressive attacks on its own citizens in Loc Hung garden. For generations, families have thrived in this farming community, Loc Hung garden. They raised their children and care for their elders.

These citizens are law-abiding citizens, yet, the Vietnamese Government sent over 1,000 officers to destroy this community and displace over 200 families.

There was no due process, no day in court, and no compensation. Instead, the Vietnamese Government took land by force from its own citizens.

These tactics cannot go unnoticed, and the world must call this out for what it is: tyranny. I ask the Vietnamese Government to allow these families to return to their homes.

On behalf of the thousands of Vietnamese citizens living in Orange Coun-

ty, I ask the Vietnamese Government to cease its behavior, cease these oppressive tactics, and let the Vietnamese people live in peace and return to their land where they have been living for generations.

□ 1445

ETHICS IN PUBLIC SERVICE INCLUDED IN THE FOR THE PEOPLE ACT

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, the American people sent us here to clean up corruption and make Washington work for them. Restoring public trust in our system of government has to be one of our top priorities.

I am proud that the very first legislation I introduced this Congress is aimed at strengthening ethics rules and slowing the revolving door between industry lobbyists and executive branch agencies.

We need to bolster the firewall between public service and corporate lobbying to ensure public servants are putting the needs of the people first, not the industries they regulate.

I am very pleased the Ethics in Public Service Act was included in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, the first major government reform package we will consider this Congress. This bill will go a long way toward elevating the people's voice in our politics by restricting the influence of dark money in campaigns, defending voting rights protections, and limiting corporate influence.

Working together, we can build a government more responsive and effective in making progress for the American people.

THE SHUTDOWN TO END ALL SHUTDOWNS

(Ms. SLOTKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the bill that I introduced called the Shutdown to End All Shutdowns, or SEAS, Act, along with 21 of my fellow freshmen.

This bill will stop the use of government shutdowns as a tool in political debate and ensure that our Federal workers are never again held hostage when Congress and the President's office cannot agree.

Under this act, if a deal cannot be reached, Members of the House, the Senate, the Executive Office of the President, and his political appointees will have their pay suspended and their travel from D.C. curtailed.

To my fellow Michiganders: This bill was because of you. You asked me why the average TSA workers, Customs and Border Patrol employees, FAA employees, and FDA employees were punished

because of something they had nothing to do with. And I heard you.

To my fellow Members of Congress who may be reticent to support a bill that penalizes ourselves: This is a moment of leadership. This is a moment to acknowledge that we may not have started this shutdown, but it is our responsibility to prevent them from happening in the future.

Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues to do the right thing and support this bill.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, without objection, the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, and notwithstanding the requirement of clause 11(a)(4)(A) of rule X, of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
 Mr. TURNER, Ohio
 Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio
 Mr. STEWART, Utah
 Mr. CRAWFORD, Arkansas
 Ms. STEFANIK, New York
 Mr. HURD, Texas
 Mr. RATCLIFFE, Texas
 There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, January 30, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
 Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 116th Congress or until modified by me. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
 Clerk of the House.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been an interesting day, perhaps more than most.

We have heard over and over again about Republicans supposedly causing

the shutdown, but in my days as a trial lawyer, judge, chief justice, it is always good to look at the evidence. And the evidence is very clear.

You had Republicans in the House and Senate and the President actually pass a spending bill in the House before the end of December, and the only thing that was keeping it from getting through the Senate was that Democrats there, led by Senator SCHUMER, would not negotiate. They arrived at no agreement to get 60 votes so that it could go forward with debate. That wasn't the Republicans.

In the position of the White House, President Trump made clear: This is negotiable, but we do need wall, we need barrier. Call it whatever you want.

He moved from talking about concrete to talking about the steel barrier. And having spent time with some other Members of Congress, invited by Congressman BIGGS and Congressman GOSAR down to the Arizona border, we saw a lot of it. And then it would just end. And then you saw a clear path right around the end of it as people kept coming, invading this country illegally.

From the border patrolmen, it was clear some were carrying big loads of drugs. Sometimes they are able to catch them, sometimes they are not. And it sounds like, from the times I spent on the border south of McAllen, southeast of McAllen, the Texas quadrant, more often than not, they don't catch the drugs coming in. It is an invasion. It is a huge problem.

And I was hearing people, friends across the other side of the aisle, some Senators who are Democrats, acknowledging: Yes, we need to do something. But when it came to negotiating, there was no negotiation.

So we had this bill today decrying how horrible shutdowns are. But if you look at the tactics, when the tactics of the leaders—and I say at least some of the leaders—of one party are “we are not going to negotiate; we are not going to compromise; we are not going to do what is best for the country,” in effect, as they have stated on prior occasions, as they have voted on prior occasions, some of them, that is what causes a shutdown.

You know, we did not need this shutdown. We shouldn't have had to have this shutdown. It should have been agreed back in December by at least some of the Senators so that we could have gotten a spending bill.

Of course, we had spending passed on three-fourths of the government. It was about one-fourth of the government that was not funded. So we talk about a shutdown. It wasn't a full shutdown. But, still, it did harm to those who were not getting paid.

But as I would go through airports—and TSA agents would know who I was—numerous times I was told: We are hurting not getting paid, but we are all right. We are going to be a whole lot worse off if we don't get a

wall or a barrier or something built and start securing the border.

We heard from teachers who were saying: We love our kids, we want to teach them, but it is so unfair to the students who are already there to have people brought in and say you have got to educate these, and they don't speak English. And the teachers would say it really did damage, it does damage to those students that we are supposed to also teach. And now, all of a sudden, we have people we have to teach who don't speak English.

There are some school districts that have done a great job of trying to work around that and teach English in an immersion-type setting so that we can help people not be relegated to manual labor the rest of their lives, but help them speak good English so that they can get good jobs.

But we need a barrier in some places on the border where we don't have it, and that is clear. You can't just have a 20-, 30-foot barrier just proceeding along that is stopping the drugs, stopping the sex trafficking, stopping the human trafficking, and then just stop it. Because, as we saw down the Arizona border, the path goes for miles and miles, and it comes right up to the point where the barrier ends, and it goes right around.

In one place, there is a little barbed wire gate that is held to the barrier. This massive barrier is held with a little, probably a quarter-inch, nylon rope. And they leave it in a slip knot so you can open the gate and the drugs can come pouring in that will kill Americans.

Something had to be done. And yet what happened was the President was willing to negotiate, KEVIN MCCARTHY and the Republicans were willing to negotiate, Senator MCCONNELL and the Republicans in the Senate were willing to negotiate, and yet the word from our Speaker was: We are not negotiating at all on a barrier, a wall.

So we continued to have people in the interim, while the government was shut down, continue to die as a result of us not securing our border.

We were told by Border Patrol, every day, there are women who are pulled into sex trafficking. Every day, there are women—often young girls. We are told about one-third of the girls who are brought up to bring them into the United States illegally are raped at least once and, normally, multiple times.

As long as we keep our border so unsecured, that is going to continue. I mean, how much lack of compassion do you have to have to say: “We are fine with the rape trees; we are fine with one-third of the girls coming into the United States illegally having been raped. We are fine. We just leave things like they are. That is fine, but we are not going to negotiate because.

Apparently, from what we are hearing, even though many of the people who refuse to negotiate have talked about the need for barriers and talked

about the need for securing the border, they were very concerned that the President would get a political win by getting even part of a wall or barrier. So people are just going to have to keep suffering, getting raped and dying.

So we didn't secure the border, there is no additional wall, so they can claim the President didn't keep his promise on the wall. That was more important than saving lives, saving rapes from happening. It is all about politics.

And that is not across the aisle. I have talked to too many friends across the aisle that, if we had been left to our own resources, we could have worked something out.

□ 1500

But apparently, at the top, it was more important to keep a political win from the President than it was to do what was right for the country.

I don't know anybody on our side of the aisle who loves shutdowns, but there were some claims made in the bill that went too far, so most of us voted "no."

We don't want a shutdown, the same way we don't want anybody in our military dying. But, if we never had any military willing to risk their lives, we wouldn't have the freedoms we have today.

If we didn't have a President willing to put a stake in the sand and say: We have got to do something to secure our border. We need some barrier, wall, whatever you want to call it in some places. And I will negotiate. The amount is negotiable—he came down to about a fifth of what he had been saying and what we are told really needs to be spent, \$25 billion or so. Yet there was no negotiation on the other side.

I know there was one dollar mentioned, apparently in jest: Oh, I would give a dollar for a wall.

But it just seems so hypocritical to have a leader, or leaders, that would not negotiate in good faith, which caused a shutdown, with one side willing to negotiate on everything except we have got to have some barriers someplace and no negotiation on the other side.

Then we come in here with a bill today to condemn shutdowns that were caused by a refusal of one side to negotiate. Like I said, I know that is not the case.

There is an article here from the Washington Examiner, Anna Giaritelli. It says: "House Republicans say at least 60 Democratic lawmakers have indicated in the past few weeks that they support some type of barrier, wall, or fence at the U.S.-Mexico border, even as Democratic leaders say they won't agree to President Trump's border wall."

It is just amazing that that ends up being the climactic bill today, condemning shutdowns, after the leadership on one side says: We are not compromising; we are not moving an inch. It causes a shutdown; we will blame

that on you. We will even pass a bill. We have got a majority. We can pass a bill, you know, that condemns shutdowns.

They took out the language, thankfully, that blames the Republicans.

But I would like to recognize my very dear friend from Pennsylvania for his comments and observations.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, we are here today to talk a little bit about what we just saw, which is what the gentleman from Texas is talking about, this vote that we just had with the condemnation of shutdown.

Let's just be clear. Nobody—nobody—in this House, whether it be Democrat, Republican, conservative, liberal, anywhere in between, or in the Senate, nobody votes for shutdown. There is no bill that says: Are you voting "yea" to shut down the Federal Government or are you voting "nay"? That is not how this goes.

What happens is we are trying to fund. It is an appropriations bill. And "appropriation" is a fancy way of just saying: We are taking your tax dollars, and this what we are spending. This is our priority. This is how we are spending it.

There is a disagreement, and we can't come to an agreement. Nothing happens. That is the problem: nothing happens. So the Federal Government shuts down.

Now, we had a discussion earlier on when I said: Look, we are having this vote today to condemn this horrible thing. That doesn't fix anything. It doesn't solve a thing. It is just theater. And the American people and our country have big issues at stake that we need to get to solving. This doesn't solve anything.

This is just: Let's make sure we place blame where we think blame is so we can pound our chest and feel good and we can—oh, by the way—cover for some of our Members who voted "no" on paying Federal employees who were working. That is what this was all about.

It is in the past. It is in the past. But right now we should be talking about the negotiation which caused this whole thing in the first place.

Quite honestly, you should be able to talk and chew gum at the same time, which is: Let's have a discussion about what is appropriate at the border and keep all of the Federal Government open at the same time. But, no, we can't do that because we are not interested in securing our border.

That is really what this is all about. This is the Homeland Security appropriations bill. And if you are not talking about securing the border in the Homeland Security appropriations bill, I don't know where you are going to talk about it.

So, again, no one wants a shutdown. No one voted for a shutdown.

But I reminded the majority party that, in December, this House, under

Republican leadership, voted for a bill that would have kept the government open and, in walking and chewing gum at the same time, provided for border security that the President would have signed.

The majority leader said: You guys voted on a bill after waiting for a year that you knew couldn't pass.

Well, during that period of a year, the reason it couldn't pass is the reason it didn't pass in the Senate: because Senate Democrats refused to fund border security.

Now, I believe they are for border security, but if it says "the wall," well, that is President Trump, and we certainly can't have any of that. I would say we have got to get past that.

Look, you can dislike the President all you want. That is your prerogative. But don't translate your dislike for the President into not caring for the security of the American people. And that is what has happened here.

We are now in January, at the end of January. We don't know what the numbers for January are. We don't know the numbers for December yet. But Homeland Security reported in November, between the ports of entry, between the points of entry, 51,000 people were apprehended coming across our border. We don't know how many weren't apprehended. We just know we got 51,000.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say: We are for border security, so we want some drones and more technology and beef up the points of entry.

We are not opposed to that, but we are saying, generally, that is status quo, right? We are talking about fixing the status quo. We are not talking about doing anything in between the points of entry, which is what the discussion really is all about.

And the President is willing to do things at the points of entry and in between, but some folks are not, and that is where we are having a problem.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman mentioned the 51,000. That is just, as I understand, those who were apprehended.

Mr. PERRY. In 1 month.

Mr. GOHMERT. In 1 month. That is not everybody that was coming in.

My friend, being a general in the United States Army, served our country so meritoriously. We had a situation under President Woodrow Wilson where a small part of Pancho Villa's gang came across the border into the United States, killed some families, and then went back into Mexico.

Devout Democrat that Woodrow Wilson was, he apparently saw that small incursion as an invasion. He sent—and I have asked the Congressional Research Service for their best numbers, and the estimate, taken from articles and information they had gotten, was probably around 75,000 of a new group called the National Guard—new back in the early 1900s.

He sent them down to stand guard on the border—75,000—and sent General John Pershing down into Mexico pursuing Pancho Villa's troops. They

didn't ever get him; they got a lot of his lieutenants. But, apparently, when 75,000 people were put on the border, there was no more invasion.

If you look at the U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 4—this is our Constitution—says: “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion.”

Now, 51,000 in a month is many, many times more than the folks that Pancho Villa had come in and kill Americans. Would the gentleman consider that an invasion, what we have going on on our southern border?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I am not sure what else to call it.

We are a generous people, and I, myself, am the product of legal immigration through Ellis Island. We want to remain that way. The United States is the most generous nation on the planet in that regard, I think last year admitting, legally, about 1.7 million people into our country.

All we are saying is: Listen, please just knock on the door. We have a process here. We have got to do it the right way. Don't just barge in. Just ring the doorbell.

But these folks are saying: Well, we don't want to ring the doorbell.

You can clearly see why, if you are trafficking in little girls or young men, if you are trafficking in the 90-plus percent of heroin coming across the border and into every single town, laced with fentanyl.

If you are trafficking in MS-13, you are not going to go to the point of entry and say: “Hey, Mr. Border Patrolman, I have got this stash of drugs here. You don't mind if I bring this into your country.” No, you are going to go where they are not.

The President is saying this is where we need to secure our border as well, as well as the points of entry.

Again, I don't understand why we are in this mutually exclusive position. I don't think that Democrats don't want to secure the border, but securing the border has to be more, something more than putting a drone up in the sky so that we can see them coming.

The point is that they don't get across the border, not just to see them coming, but that they don't get onto our side of the border with whatever they are bringing and that we interdict them. That is the issue here.

So I think we should be closer than we are, and I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to just appeal to their better angels.

We don't have to side with the cartels. Republicans and Democrats can be together and siding with the American people and securing America and its people from this unsafe circumstance, whether it is gang members and gang-related violence, whether it is drugs coming into our community, or wheth-

er it is low-skilled labor that puts our low-skilled labor—there are people in America, believe it or not, who don't graduate high school, and they have a hard time finding a job because they don't have an education.

Not only are they competing against the things that they have in their own circumstance—right?—of not having an education in their own country, but now they are competing against other people who don't have a high school education from another country, who are willing to work for less than they are.

If we don't stand up for the least of those in our community who have the least, who have the worst disadvantage against them, our constituents, who is going to?

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: It is really time to stop with the theater here and the blame game. It is what it is now. Nobody votes for a shutdown. Nobody votes for a shutdown. But stop with all that, and let's get to real, live negotiations.

You don't have to side with the cartels. You can side with the American citizens. You don't even have to consider it siding with the President of the United States if you find that unpalatable. You can side with the citizens in your community who don't want MS-13, who don't want heroin, who don't want fentanyl, who don't want people stealing their wages from the citizens in their community.

So I would just appeal to them. I know their heart is good, so we just ask them to negotiate in good faith.

The good gentleman from Texas and I will be here when they come up with their plan. We have asked—right?—for 30-some days: What is your plan? We know you don't like the President. We got that. But what is your plan? Have we seen it? I haven't seen anything yet, right? I haven't seen their proposal yet.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I do want to hit one point that the gentleman made about the drones. They can help. The television cameras, all of the sophistication, the technology, can help.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was not here when \$8 billion, as I recall, was passed in the House and Senate, signed by the President, and given to protect our southern border for, the terminology I recall, a virtual wall. And that was not a wall but cameras, airplanes, drones, whatever they could get, whatever they needed, whether it was microphones, listening—it was whatever the Secretary of Homeland Security thought appropriate.

There was a provision that was added in the Senate that became part of the law that said, if the Secretary of Homeland Security decides that money is not going to accomplish the purpose of securing the border, then she can wave that off and spend the money elsewhere.

That is what Secretary Napolitano did, as I recall. She waved it off.

I have been trying to find out for a number of years now: Where did that \$8 billion go that was supposed to be for this technology that we are hearing from some across the aisle: That is all we need is that?

Well, not one single Democrat did I ever hear say: Do you know what? Napolitano shouldn't have waved off a virtual wall.

□ 1515

They agreed that just wasn't going to do it. Secretary Napolitano said that is not going to do it. That is not going to help secure the border.

That is all we hear in response to President Trump saying wall, barrier. Whatever you want to call it, it is what we need there.

I yield to my friend, Mr. PERRY.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I can't speak to what happened in the past, and I don't know where the money went either, but I know where we are today.

I know that our communities are in peril for these issues that we have discussed already. I am sure, coming from Texas, you can name people's names. I can name people who have been murdered, who have died of overdoses. Even if you are just an average taxpaying citizen in Pennsylvania—I don't know about other States—but in Pennsylvania, we pay at least \$1.3 billion annually just for illegal immigration in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that doesn't include healthcare and social services. That is education and incarceration. And we are 2,000 miles from the border.

If you are a senior citizen in Pennsylvania, where our property taxes are high, you have paid your mortgage, you are no longer working, you are on a fixed income, you are counting on your retirement and maybe your Social Security and your savings, and the price tag keeps going up because people keep coming into your community illegally. You are in peril of losing your home, you are looking to your representatives and saying: Sir, ma'am, what are you doing about this problem? We cannot accept this. We don't want to lose our home to pay for this problem that shouldn't be happening.

Regardless of what happened in the past, I can't fix that. But what we are saying in this House, as Republicans, is the status quo of 51,000 people in 1 month getting caught between the entry points cannot continue. It is too much. It must be stopped. We must do something.

If the other side has a better plan, God bless them. I am ready to sit down and look at it, but we have been waiting for it since December 20-something. It is now the end of January. We are prepared. The gentleman from Texas, the Representative from Texas, and I are willing to consider whatever they have, but we don't have anything so far.

This President has offered, I think, four or five times things that they

have wanted and said: Let's come to the table.

We can't fix it on our own. We need their involvement. We need their input.

We just beseech them: Let's get past all this theater. Let's get down to brass tacks here and start saving our community.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania so much for sharing his thoughts. It continues to be a problem every day.

An article here from *The Hill*, by Madison Gesiotto, says: "The Mexican Government is doing more to combat illegal immigration into the United States than the entire Democratic Party put together. While the Democrats continue to pretend the crisis on our southern border is imaginary, Mexico is heavily investing in border security in anticipation of yet another massive caravan of migrants heading for the United States."

It goes on: "Hundreds of Honduran migrants began their journey in hopes of seeking asylum at our southern border, a goal that proved elusive to the previous caravan. Instead of dismissing the new caravan as a 'manufactured crisis' as the Democrats did after President Trump made his appeal . . . Mexican authorities sprang into action, announcing a list of strengthened requirements to address the problem."

"According to the latest reports, the Mexican Government is reinforcing all the entry points along its own southern border with additional immigration enforcement agents and is stepping up surveillance of known illegal crossing points. It also plans to enforce strict immigration protocols, such as requiring the migrants to undergo biometric scans and acquire immigration documents before they can enter the country."

So that is Mexico. We have worked on a bill in the past that said, if you think the Mexican law is so much better than ours, why don't we just adopt the policies and the laws of Mexico, with regard to immigration? The bottom line is, if we were to do that, we wouldn't have millions of illegal immigrants in this country.

I have to give the President some credit here. When we see this article from Reuters, an unlikely source, it points out: "The United States sent the first Central American asylum seeker back to Mexico through a crossing at the border city of Tijuana on Tuesday as part of a hardened immigration policy, an official at Mexico's National Migration Institute said."

Somebody has been doing some amazing negotiating in order to make that happen, where Mexico would agree to take back some folks who are claiming asylum. As I understand it, we may have more people going back to Mexico, pending their hearing.

As we heard from Secretary Nielsen back in December before our committee, where there are walls and barriers in place, it cuts illegal immigra-

tion by 90 to 95 percent. That is something that works. Nothing is going to work 100 percent, but that is amazing at how well it works.

I now yield to my good friend, Congressman GAETZ.

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

As we gather here on the floor, the gentleman from Texas and I would note that most Americans are working on a Wednesday afternoon at 3:20 eastern time. Most Americans are trying to advance their careers, their lives, their families. I am just tragically disappointed at the lack of work going on in this Congress.

I think one of the reasons that we haven't been so productive is that we have not seen the Democratic majority put on this floor what their border security legislation even is. I know what the Republican view is as we head into conference. I know that because Speaker PELOSI, in the White House, told the President we could not pass a border security bill here. Directly following that challenge, we came to the floor. We prioritized our borders, our laws, the rule of law. We prioritized the wages of American families, the safety of communities throughout our country. And we passed \$5.7 billion for border funding for a barrier and sent that over to the Senate.

I just don't understand, Madam Speaker, why the challenge that the Democrats gave Republicans is one the majority is unwilling to meet. If Democrats have a bill, put it on the floor. Show us what the majority's ideas are.

Madam Speaker, there has been a conference committee that has been appointed. It will get together, and I sure hope that conference report produces something that looks like a whole lot of border security, a whole lot of barrier and wall and fencing.

I only can imagine the challenge my Republican colleagues must have, because Democrats know what Republicans want, but we don't know what Democrats want, so it is kind of hard to negotiate.

We have to have a win-win to get out of this system where we seem to careen from shutdown to shutdown and crisis to crisis as a mechanism to gain leverage against one another for our respective priorities. But the right thing to do is to just put on the floor what you believe in.

I know what Republicans believe in because we voted for it. That seems to be a fair challenge back to those who are currently in the majority. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am very grateful to my friend, Congressman GAETZ, for that insightful comment. The gentleman is right. When you are right, you are right.

I would like to comment on something else that has been in the news, and that is the longest war in which the United States has ever been engaged.

For a little history, it took a few weeks for the United States to find out

where the training and preparation for 9/11 came from, and that the Taliban and Osama bin Laden were behind it. They had control of Afghanistan, the Taliban did.

It was an amazing bit of negotiation by President Bush, with incredible help from intelligence and special operations. The special ops people from our military were able to negotiate an agreement with tribal leaders that ended up being called the Northern Alliance. It contained some people who have become friends, people who love their country.

By October, we were putting in about 300 special ops military. There is a great book called "Horse Soldiers" that delves into this issue, and a movie, "12 Strong," although the ending wasn't quite accurate. Our American forces were never to lead an operation. They were to support Dostum in his operations, which is what they did, heroically.

By the end of February 2002, apparently, there was no organized Taliban left in Afghanistan. It had done an amazing job. The heroic fighting of those in the Northern Alliance, the Afghans led by General Dostum, did an amazing job.

We provided some weapons. We gave them aerial—well, there were B-52s flying, but only our special ops guys could call down bombs.

The leaders could tell the Americans: Look, there is a bunker. There is a problem.

They would get the coordinates, call down the bomb, take care of it. Dostum and his folks would go in and clean up. That is how, by the end of October, we had not lost a single American, and the Taliban had been defeated.

Unfortunately, at that point, we became occupiers. We sent in lots of American military, and in the 7-plus years of Commander in Chief George W. Bush, we lost just over 600 precious American military lives in Afghanistan.

During the 8 years of Commander in Chief Obama—I believe, personally, it was because of the tough rules of engagement, and our people not being able to defend themselves until it was sometimes too late—we lost about three times as many people under Commander in Chief Obama as we did under Commander in Chief Bush. Whatever the problem, the buck stops with the Commander in Chief, and we lost three times as many when the war was supposed to be virtually over.

What happened, once we became occupiers, was then more Afghans were joining the Taliban. I have talked with an individual who was part of the inner circle that was being made at the State Department about what kind of government we would give the Afghans.

That shouldn't have been our job. We defeated the Taliban, or the Northern Alliance did with our help. They should have been the ones deciding what kind of government.

The people I have talked to in Afghanistan, friends I have made there,

they said: Look, there is not a much better place on Earth fitted for a federalist form of government where the power is in the states or provinces and in the localities. We don't need a big powerful dictator. We need strong states or provinces.

Yet, the constitution we hoisted onto the Afghan people, led by a man who is now in the State Department once again leading efforts—as I understand it, he is the guy who said let's give them a centrist government.

That is what the constitution gave Afghanistan. The President of Afghanistan appoints the governors. He appoints the mayors. He appoints the police chief.

The people in Afghanistan have said: Look, this is horrendous. This is a formula for corruption. For heaven's sake, at least let us elect our governors, elect our mayors. Let us choose our own police chiefs.

□ 1530

But that is not the constitution that we gave them. But there has been an amendment movement for some time. The Obama administration would not support it because they had some of the same State Department people that said: No, let's keep this corrupt centrist—they didn't say corrupt, but that is exactly what it gave them. And the Afghan people don't like what America forced on them.

The solution is, encourage them. And since we spend billions of dollars there, look, you want another dime? Amend the constitution; allow an election of governors and mayors, local selection of police chiefs. Let's return the power to the provinces.

As my friend, former Minister Massoud, there has said: Look, if you will help us get that amendment done, then whenever America leaves, we have got power back in our local areas. So if the Taliban takes over one province, or tries to take over the national government, all the other provinces can rise up and come after them and kick them out like we did last time.

But as long as we have got this coerced, very centralized government, all they have got to do is knock off a few people at the top; which is why we have people that shouldn't still be in the State Department who are negotiating with the Taliban, not even our friends. Our friends are going to be dead when we pull out because we are leaving all this power for easy reach of the Taliban.

We ought to be negotiating with our former allies, the ones that defeated the Taliban within six months, and get them that amendment, push them to get that, help them have those first elections under the amended constitution, and then get the heck out of Afghanistan.

In that regard, we have a man who is not here on the floor this week, hasn't been in January, named WALTER JONES. He wanted us out of Afghanistan, and he has for a very long time.

He is not going to be around to see that happen is the indication.

But, Madam Speaker, I know there are many of us that love that guy, and I was sad to see him in hospice last Friday. Prayers are with his family, because WALTER is going to go home and be better off. But we miss him.

I was heartened to see our friend, ALCEE HASTINGS here on the floor a while ago. He has been going through a difficult bout of pancreatic cancer; been going through chemo, and I know my friends on both sides of the aisle will continue to pray for and encourage him.

We can have strong disagreements. We don't wish anybody to go through what WALTER and ALCEE have been going through.

One other friend that I spoke to in the last week, she has been in my prayers, Anne Graham Lotz. What an incredible gift to America Billy Graham's children have been. And our prayers will continue to be for Anne, ALCEE, and my friend, WALTER, and his family.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family matter.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I respectfully submit the Rules of the Committee on Armed Services for the 116th Congress, as adopted by the committee on January 24, 2019.

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman"), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report

to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security cooperation and humanitarian assistance activities (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy, and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (a)(2) and are required to conduct oversight in their respective jurisdictions, pursuant to clause 2(b)(2) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of six standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: Army programs and accounts related to aircraft, ground equipment, missiles, ammunition, and other procurement; Marine Corps programs and accounts related to ground and amphibious equipment, fighter aircraft, helicopters, air-launched weapons, and ammunition; Air Force programs and accounts related to fighter, training, reconnaissance and surveillance, and electronic warfare aircraft, helicopters, air-launched weapons, ground equipment, and ammunition; Navy programs and accounts related to fighter, training, and electronic warfare aircraft, helicopters, and air-launched weapons; tactical air and missile defense programs and accounts; chemical agent and munition destruction programs and accounts; and National Guard and Reserve equipment programs and accounts.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Department of Defense policy and programs and accounts related to military personnel and their families, Reserve Component integration and employment, military health care, military education, dependent schools, POW/MIA issues, Morale, Welfare and Recreation, commissaries, cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and military retirement issues.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Department of Defense policy and programs and accounts related to military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance, military construction, organic industrial base, the civilian and contract workforce, environment, military installations and real property management, family housing, base realignments and closures, and energy.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy and Marine Corps acquisition

programs and accounts related to shipbuilding and conversion, reconnaissance and surveillance, tanker, and airlift aircraft, ship and submarine-launched weapons, ammunition, and other procurements; Air Force programs and accounts related to bomber, tanker, and airlift aircraft; Army programs and accounts related to waterborne vessels; and Maritime policy and programs and accounts under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Department of Defense and Department of Energy policy related to strategic deterrence, strategic stability, nuclear weapons, strategic and nuclear arms control, nonproliferation, nuclear safety, missile defense, and space; Department of Defense programs and accounts related to nuclear weapons, strategic missiles, nuclear command and control systems, Department of Defense intelligence space, space systems and services of the military departments, and intermediate and long-range missile defense systems; and Department of Energy national security programs and accounts.

Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Department of Defense policy and programs and accounts related to military intelligence, national intelligence, countering weapons of mass destruction, counter-proliferation, counter-terrorism, other sensitive military operations, special operations forces, cyber security, cyber operations, cyber forces, information technology, information operations, and science and technology (including defense-wide programs and accounts related to research, development, testing, and evaluation, except for those defense-wide programs and accounts related to research, development, testing, and evaluation of missile defense systems).

(3) **Definitions**—For the purposes of subparagraph (a)(2):

(A) The phrase “programs and accounts” means acquisition and modernization programs, sustainment planning during program development, and related funding lines for procurement, advanced development, advanced component development and prototypes, systems development, sustainment planning, and demonstration.

(B) The term “policy” means statutes, regulations, directives, and other institutional guidance.

(C) The phrase “science and technology” means science and technology programs and related funding lines for basic research, applied research, and non-acquisition program advanced development.

(b) **Membership of the Subcommittees**

(1) Subcommittee memberships shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the majority party’s caucus and the minority party’s conference, respectively.

(2) The Chairman of the Committee and the Ranking Minority Member thereof (hereinafter referred to as the “Ranking Minority Member”) may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) **Committee Panels**

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the majority party, all majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman, and all minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member. The Chairman shall choose one of the majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member shall similarly choose the ranking minority member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) **Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces**

(1) The Chairman, or the chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the chairman and the ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member or the ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall similarly appoint the ranking minority member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the concurrence of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee whose chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman, or the chairman of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the chairman of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman, or the chairman of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the

Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2)(A) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(g)(2)(B) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force, the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in

executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the chairman and the ranking minority member of a subcommittee, panel, or task force.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or the chairman and the ranking minority member of a subcommittee, panel, or task force, as appropriate, will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee, panel, or task force may be recognized by a subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee, panel, or task force members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or the chairman of a subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the majority and the minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee, panel, or task force shall be submitted to the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the chairman of a subcommittee, panel, or task force, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee, panel, or task force shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

“Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee, panel, or task force) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, panel, or task force, members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman, subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or the subcommittee, panel, or task force chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force for consideration.

RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other com-

mittee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, or the chairman of a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member or the most senior minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)(B)(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information

that is received which is classified as Confidential or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or the chairmen of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than January 2nd of each odd-numbered year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

MADAM SPEAKER, Pursuant to cl. 2(a) of House Rule XI, I submit the rules for the Committee on the Budget for publication in the Congressional Record. The rules for the Committee on the Budget were adopted by voice vote at the Organizational Meeting held on January 29 at 9:30 a.m. in 1334 Longworth House Office Building.

JOHN YARMUTH.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

(a) Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, or a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair (within 24 hours), or a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a non-debatable motion of privilege in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the Chair of the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(c) The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out these rules or facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

RULE 2—VICE CHAIR

The Chair of the Committee shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as Vice Chair of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Vice Chair shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the Chair.

MEETINGS

RULE 3—REGULAR MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session, if notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c) and paragraph (g)(3) of clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

(c) The Chair shall give written notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day) on which members have notice thereof, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 4—ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) The Chair may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chair shall provide public electronic notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least three days in advance when Congress is not in session.

RULE 5—OPEN BUSINESS MEETINGS

(a) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the Ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(b) Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) No person, other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Com-

mittee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

(d) Not later than 24 hours after commencing a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the Chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such measure or matter and any amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 6—QUORUM

A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

RULE 7—RECOGNITION

Any member, when recognized by the Chair, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

RULE 8—CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chair or by a majority vote of the Committee members, a quorum being present.

RULE 9—AVAILABILITY OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Committee shall consider no bill, joint resolution, or concurrent resolution unless copies of the measure have been made available to all Committee members at least 24 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. When considering concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete Chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for Committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended with the concurrence of the Chair and Ranking minority member.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 10—PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) In the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment. Subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters, which have already been amended in their entirety.

(b) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

RULE 11—ROLL CALL VOTES

(a) A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a roll call may be had on the request of any member.

(b) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a quorum is present for such purpose.

(c) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a record of the vote of each Committee member on each recorded vote shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48

hours of such record vote, and, with respect to any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

RULE 12—PROXY VOTING

No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

HEARINGS

RULE 13—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

The Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Such announcement shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form.

RULE 14—OPEN HEARINGS

(a) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the task forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

RULE 15—MEMBER DAY HEARING REQUIREMENT

During the first session of the 116th Congress, the Committee shall hold a Member Day Hearing to hear testimony from members, delegates, and the resident commissioner—whether or not they are a member of the Committee—on budget priorities and process.

RULE 16—QUORUM

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 17—QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(a) Questioning of witnesses will be conducted under the five-minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion pursuant to clause 2(j) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) In questioning witnesses under the five-minute rule:

(1) First, the Chair and the Ranking minority member shall be recognized;

(2) Next, the Committee members present at the time the hearing is called to order shall be recognized in order of seniority; and

(3) Finally, the Committee members not present at the time the hearing is called to order may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing.

(c) In recognizing Committee members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and

shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section (a), the Chair and Ranking minority member may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or may designate staff from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes.

RULE 18—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(a) In accordance with clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee or by the Chair (pursuant to such rules and limitations as the Committee may prescribe) may be issued over the signature of the Chair or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(b) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

RULE 19—WITNESSES' STATEMENTS

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or sub-grant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(c) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

RULE 20—COMMITTEE PRINTS

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

RULE 21—COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

RULE 22—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee and to the provisions of the following sections, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair.

(b) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to Committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(c) All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(d) Notwithstanding sections (a), (b), and (c), staff shall be employed in compliance with House Rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

RULE 23—STAFF SUPERVISION

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he or she deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with Rule X, clause 9(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives) and job titles, and, at his or her discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority, as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

RULE 24—PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) A substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings shall be made of all hearings and business meetings subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(b) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal, which shall among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is taken.

(c) Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The Chair may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he or she determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

RULE 25—ACCESS TO COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) The Chair shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with clause 2(e) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives).

(b) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and staff of the Office of Official Reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(c) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(d) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the Ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

OVERSIGHT

RULE 26—GENERAL OVERSIGHT

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, ad-

ministration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The Committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause 1(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of Rule X of the House Rules, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than March 1 of the first session of a Congress, the Chair shall prepare, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, and submit to the Committees on Oversight and Reform and House Administration an oversight plan for that Congress in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall provide a copy of that plan to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and must include any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a member of the Committee.]

REPORTS

RULE 27—AVAILABILITY BEFORE FILING

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the Committee shall be available to all Committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the Ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the Committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the Committee, either or both sections (a) and (b) may be waived by the Chair or with a majority vote by the Committee.

RULE 28—REPORT ON THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The report of the Committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include any roll call vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

RULE 29—PARLIAMENTARIAN'S STATUS REPORT AND SECTION 302 STATUS REPORT

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 311 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under sections 302 and 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The Committee authorizes the Chair, in consultation with the Ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

RULE 30—ACTIVITY REPORT

(a) After an adjournment sine die of a regular session of a Congress or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, the chair of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives without the approval of the Committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(b) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee; a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made; a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon; and a delineation of any hearings held.

MISCELLANEOUS

RULE 31—BROADCASTING OF MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(a) It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 32—COMMITTEE WEBSITE

(a) The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members, other members of the House, and the public. The Ranking minority member may maintain a similar website for the same purpose, including communicating information about the activities of the minority to Committee members, other members of the House, and the public.

RULE 33—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chair subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee.

(b) The Chair shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

RULE 34—WAIVERS

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chair may, if practical, consult with the Committee members on whether the Chair should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the Act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 31, 2019, at noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Division Chief, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Bump-Stock-Type Devices [Docket No.: 2018R-22F; AG Order No.: 4367-2018] (RIN: 1140-AA52) received January 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VELA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HECK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BASS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. TAKANO,

Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CRIST, Ms. OMAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. LAMB, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SIREs, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BERA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. DEAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CASE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. PORTER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. RYAN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KIM, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CROW, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TRONE, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 7. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX

of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 860. A bill to protect our Social Security system and improve benefits for current and future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 861. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent surprise billing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 862. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 863. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 864. A bill to support wildlife conservation, improve anti-trafficking enforcement, provide dedicated funding at no expense to taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HECK, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms.

LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 865. A bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 866. A bill to provide a lactation room in public buildings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 867. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to prohibit any individual who served as the head of any element of the intelligence community from acting as the agent of a foreign principal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 868. A bill to repeal the restriction on the use of funds by the Internal Revenue Service to bring transparency to the political activity of certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TRONE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 869. A bill to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. OMAR,

Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. ALLRED):

H.R. 870. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GALLEGRO (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 871. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Bears Ears National Monument, to ensure prompt engagement with the Bears Ears Commission and prompt implementation of the Proclamation establishing the Bears Ears National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 872. A bill to reauthorize the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program and certain wildlife conservation funds, to establish prize competitions relating to the prevention of wildlife poaching and trafficking, wildlife conservation, the management of invasive species, and the protection of endangered species, to amend the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 to modify the protections provided by that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 873. A bill to assist employers providing employment under special certificates issued under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to transform their business and program models, to support individuals with disabilities to transition to competitive integrated employment, to phase out the use of such special certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 875. A bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 876. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a plan for the purchase and installation of an earthquake early warning system for the Cascadia Subduction Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to modernize the funding of wildlife conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 879. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify the percentages of funds to be allocated to certain urbanized areas under the surface transportation block grant program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal loopholes for major integrated oil companies, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 881. A bill to require certain meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be transparent and open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 882. A bill to provide employees with 2 hours of paid leave in order to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 883. A bill to grant lawful permanent resident status to certain eligible persons who were separated from immediate family members by the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 884. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 885. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to modify the dischargeability of debts for certain educational payments and loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. CROW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GAETZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. MAST, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNN, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 886. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 887. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 877 East 1200 South in Orem, Utah, as the "Jerry C. Washburn Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. SPANO):

H.R. 888. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KIM, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 889. A bill to limit the use of funds to reduce the total number of members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who are deployed to the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 890. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 891. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes related to family-sponsored immigrants and to reduce the number of such immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to limit attorney fees and penalties in citizen suits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BARRAGÁN):

H.R. 893. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to direct the Bureau of Prisons to provide certain voting information to Federal prisoners upon their release from prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 894. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for clear title to certain land in Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 895. A bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits program; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 896. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require radio and television broadcasters to provide free broadcasting time for political advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 897. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POSEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for lifelong learning accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 899. A bill to terminate the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 900. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the way beneficiaries are assigned under the Medicare shared savings program by also basing

such assignment on primary care services furnished by nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and clinical nurse specialists; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reestablish the 15 percent corporate rate bracket; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 902. A bill to direct the President to impose duties on merchandise from the People's Republic of China to compensate holders of United States intellectual property rights for losses resulting from violations of such intellectual property rights in China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 903. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for Congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. DESJARLAIS):

H.R. 904. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that wages paid to unauthorized aliens may not be deducted from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RYAN, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HILL of Arkansas):

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow members of the Ready Reserve of a reserve component of the Armed Forces to make elective deferrals on the basis of their service to the Ready Reserve and on the basis of their other employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 906. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 907. A bill to clarify exclusions from the definition of a deposit broker; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals only enrolled in Medicare Part A to contribute to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 909. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide parity among States in the timing of the application of higher Federal Medicaid matching rates for the ACA-expansion population; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MALINOWSKI):

H.R. 910. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to provide for in-flight refueling of Saudi or Saudi-led coalition aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing coalition intervention in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BACON, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 911. A bill to require the installation of secondary cockpit barriers on existing aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 912. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 913. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to promote access to life-saving therapies for Medicaid enrollees by ensuring coverage of routine patient costs for items and services furnished in connection with participation in qualifying clinical trials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KIM, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 914. A bill to limit the use of funds to reduce the total number of members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who are deployed to Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SBUZZI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 915. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Federal prohibition against stalking in order

to provide protection to friends and co-workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. REED, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 916. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require a certain percentage of COPS grant funds to be used for the salaries and benefits of school resource officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 917. A bill to assign the responsibility for conducting prosecutions for violations of the laws of the District of Columbia to the head of a local prosecutor's office designated under local law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 918. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require certain tax-exempt organizations to include on annual returns the names and addresses of substantial contributors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 919. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. SIRE):

H.R. 920. A bill to restrict the transfer of defense articles, defense services, and crime control articles to any element of the security forces of Venezuela that is under the authority of a government of Venezuela that is not recognized as the legitimate government of Venezuela by the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 921. A bill to establish the policy of the United States regarding the no-first-use of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 922. A bill to promote fair and transparent virtual currency markets by examining the potential for price manipulation; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 923. A bill to promote United States competitiveness in the evolving global virtual currency marketplace; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 924. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his contributions to civil rights, his loyalty and patriotism to the Nation, and his dedication to justice and equality; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 925. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for allocation to carry out approved wetlands conservation projects under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 926. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to consider the appropriate inclusion of residential manufactured homes in certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 927. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in conjunction with the Secretary of Transportation, to carry out a Sustainable Communities Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VELA, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 928. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify aliens who have served, or are serving, in the Armed Forces of the United States when those aliens apply for an immigration benefit or are placed in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. MAST, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 929. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rabbi Michael Ber Weissmandl in recognition of his acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 930. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national standard for incorporating a passive identification ability into all firearms sold in the United States, and to require the reporting of lost or stolen firearms to the appropriate law enforcement authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 931. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a former Member of Congress from serving as a lobbyist until the former Member has met any obligation imposed on the former Member under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reimburse the Treasury for amounts paid as

settlements and awards under such Act in the case of an act committed personally by the former Member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 932. A bill to authorize certain long-term contracts for Federal purchases of energy; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 933. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. HIMES, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CROW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COX of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. REED, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARBAJAL,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUIZ, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CASE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. RUSH):

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States waiving the application of the first article of amendment to the political speech of corporations and other business organizations with respect to the disbursement of funds in connection with public elections and granting Congress and the States the power to establish limits on contributions and expenditures in elections for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol to honor the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient of the Second World War upon death; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Supreme Court misinterpreted the First Amendment to the Constitution in the case of Buckley v. Valeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H. Res. 89. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should grant asylum to Aasiya Noreen, internationally known as Asia Bibi, and her immediate family, due to the persecution she has faced on account of her religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H. Res. 90. A resolution supporting the observation of "National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month" during January 2019 to promote efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of human trafficking and modern slavery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 91. A resolution reaffirming the robust commitment of the House of Representatives to the importance of the United States-Greek strategic partnership; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 92. A resolution calling for the immediate extradition or rendering to the United States of convicted felons William Morales, Joanne Chesimard, and all other fugitives from justice who are receiving safe harbor in Cuba in order to escape prosecution or confinement for criminal offenses committed in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 93. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia are a part of the sovereign state of Georgia and condemning the decision by the Syrian Arab Republic to recognize these territories as independent of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 7.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause, which 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises[.]

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Amendment XVI

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV,

Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay

and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18) The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12: "to raise and support armies"

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof

By Mr. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress has the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof . . ."

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the US Constitution

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution sets forth Congress's enumerated powers, and the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Page H1305).

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress's Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' powers granted under article I of the United States Constitution, including the legislative vesting clause of article I, section 1; the power granted to each House of Congress under article I, section 5, clause 2; and the power granted to Congress under article I, section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause I and Article I Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises . . ."

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to "provide for the common defense," as enumerated in Article I, Section of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the US Constitution.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the US Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO

H.R. 924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 5 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BANKS:

H.J. Res. 36.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.J. Res. 37.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.J. Res. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 39.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.J. Res. 40.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 24: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. ROY.

H.R. 51: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 94: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 95: Mr. TONKO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 101: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 126: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 141: Mr. CISNEROS and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 180: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 205: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 218: Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 219: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 230: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 231: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 273: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 295: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 299: Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. CASE, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CROW, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. KIM, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. HECK, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 302: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 303: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 330: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 335: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 339: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 361: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 367: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 372: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 473: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 478: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CASE, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 485: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 491: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 497: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 510: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HECK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 516: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 530: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 536: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 543: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 550: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COLE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. VELA, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 554: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 562: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 587: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 592: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 596: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 598: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 610: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 613: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 616: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 619: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 628: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 647: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STEWART, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 660: Mr. HILL of Arkansas.

H.R. 662: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 674: Ms. PORTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 677: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 720: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 724: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEUSER, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 732: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 734: Ms. PRESSLEY and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 748: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GOODEN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 754: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 762: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 763: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 768: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 777: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 778: Mr. PALMER and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 780: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 781: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 784: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. COMER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 790: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 793: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 804: Mr. COHEN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 807: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 810: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILD, Ms. DELAURIO, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 811: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 834: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 840: Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 843: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 850: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 854: Mr. SIRES.

H.J. Res. 5: Mr. SPANO.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. MEUSER.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 12: Mr. ZELDIN.

H. Res. 17: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 33: Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 58: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Res. 60: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H. Res. 72: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 75: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 84: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H. Res. 88: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. WILD, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. KILDEE.