

that we improve the ultimate competitiveness of our businesses, our families, our communities, and the health, the basic health, the right to live with dignity and respect for all of our people.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, that was incredible. And obviously, many of us in the Congressional Progressive Caucus have fully supported so much of what Medicare for All stands for. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her leadership and courage for taking on such a bold move.

Madam Speaker, I am very honored to be here representing the community that raised me. I was raised in Southwest Detroit, in the 13th Congressional District. Growing up in Southwest Detroit, I actually thought that smell was normal, all the pollution that I kind of grew up in, all the truck traffic. As I got older, I realized it wasn't normal. It wasn't normal that so many of my neighbors were getting cancer or had respiratory issues. It wasn't normal that one of five children have asthma.

We have one of the highest—one of the worst air qualities in the State of Michigan in the 13th Congressional District; and it is the third poorest Congressional District in the country.

So the deadly consequences of being uninsured is real for my constituents at home; through no fault of their own, but for the fact that they live in communities that are polluted and communities that lack so much opportunity to be able to thrive.

So this is an important issue, not only to millions of Americans today, but to my residents; this need for universal healthcare. It is a topic that most, if not all of us in this Chamber were sent here to work on. It is a topic that is always on the minds of our residents every single day. It is a topic that is literally a life or death situation, and an issue that has bankrupted many of our families; an issue that we should not be worried about in this country.

We are the richest country on the planet, but the United States is the only industrialized country without universal healthcare.

Fifty thousand residents in my district are uninsured. This is why I am thrilled and excited that over 100 of my colleagues have signed on to sponsor the Medicare for All Act.

More than 30 million Americans are without access to healthcare right now without insurance, with an additional 40 million who cannot afford co-pays and the deductible.

Pharmaceutical companies make billions, Madam Speaker, in profits, while working Americans are forced to go through extraordinary measures to pay for care.

Just the other day, I heard a mother talk about losing her 6-year-old child, her little girl, because she couldn't afford insulin. This is why we need something bold, courageous, transformational, and that is supporting Medicare for All.

We spend the highest amount per capita in the world on healthcare. We need a better system for our constituents. We need Medicare for All.

This system is one that many more of my colleagues should get behind. It provides a system where our constituents will know that they are secure and getting healthcare that they need today. This is a system that will take away the worry of our constituents who have constant, day-in, day-out thinking about the cost of healthcare, and whether or not their current insurance even covers it.

It is really important to be clear about Medicare for All. One, it includes comprehensive coverage for primary care, for hospital, outpatient services, prescription drugs, reproductive health services, newborn care, long-term care services. This is so critical for my residents.

Constantly do I hear, day-in, day-out of families that are taking care of their parents and not having access to long-term care coverage.

It supports mental health and substance abuse treatment, laboratory and diagnostic services, and so much more.

Patients will have complete freedom to choose their doctors. I am going to say this again. Patients will have complete freedom, under the Medicare for All Act, to choose their doctors, hospitals, and other providers that they wish to see.

Long-term care, again, in support for our older Americans, our neighbors, and those with disabilities, will be covered.

Medicare for All will decrease the costs by reducing inefficiency; preventing healthcare corporations from overcharging; and increasing transparency in our system.

Medicare for All will also decrease prescription drug costs by allowing Medicare to finally negotiate our prices.

The legislation also preserves healthcare programs for our veterans and our Native Americans.

Healthcare is a right, Madam Speaker, not a privilege for the wealthy.

And not only is this the most incredible class, and not because I am part of it, but it really is, it is the largest incoming class since Watergate but, more importantly, it is the most diverse.

We not only ran because we wanted to be first, or we wanted to be diverse, we ran because we speak differently; we serve differently; and we are much more courageous than, I think, previous classes ever have been.

So, I am asking our colleagues to please stand up and support Medicare for All. Give it a chance. See the possibility of finally being able to provide for our constituents' universal healthcare.

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

AND STILL I RISE

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

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And I rise tonight on the Republican side of what we call the aisle.

I do so, Madam Speaker, because the issue that I will call to the attention of this august body is not an issue that I consider a Republican issue. I don't consider it a Democratic issue. I consider this an issue for the American people, past, present, and the future.

This is an issue that has plagued our country almost since its inception. It is an issue that we have avoided with intentionality, avoided because of discomfort, avoided through the years. But it is an issue that we have to address.

So I rise tonight, Madam Speaker, with love of country at heart on the Republican side of the aisle. And I rise to announce, as I have before, that we have to take up the question of impeachment.

I rise, Madam Speaker, to say this and to give some explanations. There are many things that are being misunderstood. I trust that I can bring some degree of clarity to the issues that are misunderstood.

And I know, Madam Speaker, as I rise, and understand that this will come to a vote in this House; I know that it will be a tough vote for many people. I understand. It will be a tough vote for a multiplicity of reasons. It will be a tough vote.

I know what tough votes are like, so I understand. I have people in my community, one example, members of the clergy that I have had to explain some very tough votes to. I have some that have, to this day, not agreed with the tough votes that I have had to take.

Tough votes. I came here to take tough votes. I came here to deal with tough issues, the difficult. I came to do what I believe should have been done long before now; but the opportunity to do it has presented itself since I arrived in Congress, so I take on this challenge. And I understand that this will be a tough vote.

Before I get to some of the nuances of the explanation that I would like to give, let me just tell you who I will be voting for when I take this tough vote. I will be voting for the slave mother who had a baby ripped out of her arms, taken to the auction block.

This is why I can relate to those mothers on the border who had their babies ripped out of their arms; and still, many have not been returned to their mothers, their fathers. I can relate because I understand the historical context. I will be voting for them.

Tough vote, but I will be voting for the slave father who never got to see his child because the mother and the child were taken away, auctioned off, sent to some distant plantation; never allowed the opportunity to enjoy the love that a father ought to with a

child. That is the historical context of why I will be voting and what I will be voting for.

I will also be voting for the elderly mother who was of African ancestry, who had to say “yes, ma’am” and “yes, sir” to the 3-year-old children of the master. At that time it would have been called the boss, but it was the master; had to say “yes, ma’am” and “yes, sir” to the children.

To the father, I will vote for the father who was called “boy,” demeaned in the presence of his son. I know. I saw that happen to my father. I know about that elderly mother. I saw it happen to her, the elderly black mother. I will be voting for them. They have come through the years to get me here. I won’t forget them.

I will be voting for the LGBTQ person who was fired for showing up at work and saying I married the love of my life, who happens to be the same sex as that person was. I am an ally of the LGBTQ community.

I am going to vote for those persons who have been discriminated against.

□ 1530

I will be voting for those who lost their lives in the Tree of Life synagogue, lost their lives to bigotry, hate.

I will be voting for those who lost their lives at the church in Charlotte.

I will be voting for the woman, who was a peaceful protestor, who lost her life in Charlottesville among the bigots, the KKK, the neo-Nazis, the xenophobes, the homophobes. I will be voting for her.

And here is why I will be voting for all of them: because these Articles of Impeachment will be about bigotry emanating from the Presidency—in policy, I might add, bigotry in policy. There is clear and convincing evidence that we have bigotry in policy. I will be voting for the people who are the victims.

To those who would tell me this is not something that the Congress ought to entertain, here is what I would say. I would say, if the Congress of the United States of America could, in 1868, impeach President Andrew Johnson for speaking ill of Congress, this Congress can impeach for bigotry in policy.

It is just a question of whether 218 people, assuming all are present, will vote for it. That is what it is. It is just a question of whether we have the will to do it. The way is before us.

Article II, Section 4, all of the noted constitutional scholars—maybe there is some exception; there probably is one someplace—have concluded that Article II, Section 4 not only allows a President to be impeached for criminality, a President can also be impeached for misdeeds.

As a matter of fact, those who desire to edify themselves can read Federalist 65, read the words of Hamilton and Madison and Jay. Read their words. Let them communicate with you through the vista of time.

You will find, when you read their writings, that they were prophetic in their thoughts, that they understood that there would be a time such as this, and they have given us the recipe for this time and the means by which we can take corrective action.

When you read, you will find that, without question, they indicate that impeachment is not something that will be done without some degree of turmoil, that impeachment will be something that will sometimes be along party lines. Party lines occur when impeachment is brought before this august body.

By the way, I brought impeachment twice before, so I am talking about something that has occurred and something that will occur again.

So impeachment is something that was anticipated. It is something that is a remedy that is constitutional, and I plan to bring that remedy before this body so that we may take a stand.

Dr. King was a great man and somebody I admire, and I talk about him quite regularly. Dr. King reminded us that the truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where you stand in times of challenge and controversy. When you have hard votes to take, where do you stand?

I don’t believe bigotry should be a talking point, something that we use to get the base out at election time. We go out and we talk about, oh, how bad certain people are and we announce that they are racist, that they are bigots. I don’t think it ought to be a talking point. I think it should be an action item.

I am bringing the vote because it is going to be an action item for Congress at last. Again, it will be an action item, not just a talking point. I am going to put the moral imperative to vote for all of these people that I called to your attention and countless others above political expediency.

Political expediency allows us to push this issue to the next generation. Political expediency has allowed us to reach this point in our history where bigotry is rearing its ugly head. It is no longer covert, but it is now overt. We have reached this point in our history. So I refuse to except political expediency as a remedy.

Why not wait? Let’s defeat at the polls as opposed to impeach here in the House.

I don’t buy into that.

Now, there are many who would say let’s wait on the Mueller report. The Mueller report has nothing to do with bigotry. It most likely has to do with criminality associated with obstruction of justice, probably has something to do with emoluments, could have something to do with collusion, which is a layperson’s way of saying conspiracy. It could have something to do with all of these.

But I assure each and every person who is within the sound of my voice by whatever means, it will have nothing

to do with bigotry. So there is no need to wait for the Mueller report because the Mueller report won’t address bigotry. Those who would rather impeach for some other thing, then wait for the Mueller report.

By the way, I don’t plan to get in the way of the Mueller report, but I will say this: The Framers of the Constitution never intended for the executive branch to investigate itself, and that is what is going on.

The Framers of the Constitution understood the implications of having the executive branch investigate itself. One such implication that we see now is that the Mueller report may not be presented to Congress. It is going to the President before it gets to Congress.

The Framers never intended for the executive to investigate itself. That is the responsibility of Congress. That is why I brought Articles of Impeachment.

Pardon me for using a personal pronoun. My mother taught me better.

That is why I brought Articles of Impeachment in a previous Congress when we had Republicans in charge.

I am not going to be hypocritical and conclude now that Democrats are in charge, we don’t have the same duty, responsibility, and obligation. I am not that kind of guy. We are going to go on record. It will be a hard vote, but we are going to go on record.

Some would say: Well, how do you get the proof of the bigotry?

Easy answer—it appears to be a tough question. Easy answer: the same way we got the proof that we brought to the floor of the House for colleagues who had resolutions that were to condemn for bigoted statements. Same way, we get them from news sources.

We have plenty of empirical evidence to show us by clear and convincing evidence as a standard, or whatever standard the House uses, because there is no standard codified in the law for the House. But by whatever standard the House should use, there is plenty of empirical evidence to support bigotry in policy emanating from the Presidency, plenty of them: S---hole countries; and then you go out, by the way, where people of color happen to reside, I might add, and you go out and develop an immigration policy that adversely impacts those people of color, changing the law to adversely impact them.

Bigotry in policy? Ha. I talked about the babies at the border—people of color, I might add—separating them. We didn’t do that at Ellis Island. We didn’t do that when 12 million people came from Europe, Scandinavia. We didn’t do that. We didn’t separate them from their children. We didn’t have a flotilla out there to stop them. We didn’t try to build walls to keep them out. They came.

The people who are at the border, by the way, are exercising their rights under the law that we promulgated, that we, the United States of America,

put in place that says that they can come up and ask for asylum.

By the way, I do not contend that all who seek asylum should be granted asylum. I do think that the process, the law that we put in place, ought to be honored. And if we don't like the law, then we should change the law. There is plenty of opportunity to do so. There has been plenty of opportunity to do so. Change the law if you don't like the way we have decided to deal with these issues.

There is plenty of evidence that in the past we have accommodated persons who were trying to flee harm's way, bringing their children with them. When those persons were fleeing Castro's Cuba and traversed the shark-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico—I say "shark-infested" because there are so many people who are saying: Well, we don't want them to do this because they can be harmed along the way.

We didn't say that about the people who were traversing the shark-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico. We created a policy called wet foot, dry foot. One foot on dry land, and you had a pathway to citizenship. That was the policy of the United States of America, to accommodate.

I am not saying bring the world in. I am saying follow the law. It seems to me that is what we are all about. I believe in the law of the land that I live in and that I love. And I love my country.

So I want to assure persons that we will use the same standard of proof that we have been using on previous occasions.

Now, the next question: Impeachment is like voting to go to war. Casting a vote to impeach is comparable to casting a vote to go to war.

I visit the VA hospital annually, Madam Speaker, and I take flags to every veteran in that hospital. This year, we took 600 flags, and we needed more.

I would ask persons who believe that this is comparable to casting a vote to go to war, go to the place where you can see the price of freedom. Go to the place where you can see what the cost is, where you will see that it is not in silver and gold. Go to a VA hospital, a VA hospital where you will see persons who have lost an arm, lost a leg, no longer have vision. Many of them leave and don't return the way they left. Just go and see what the price of freedom is like.

They fight for our freedom. They are willing to give their lives for our freedom. That is what a vote for war is all about. Many don't ever return. They are the liberators. They accord us our freedom by putting their lives on the line, and it is that freedom that we have that allows us to vote to impeach.

Voting for impeachment is not a vote to go to war. You ask somebody who has lost a leg in those hospitals, talk to them. Oh, you may find one person whom you can use and try to equate

that to the rest of the world, but I assure you, those veterans don't consider impeachment comparable to voting to go to war.

I would also add this: There are those who believe that bigotry is something that the Senate won't take up.

If we use that line of logic, I shouldn't have gone to law school for fear of failure.

If we use that line of logic, we shouldn't have sent H.R. 1 over to the Senate, because it has been prognosticated that the Senate won't take it up in any meaningful way.

□ 1545

If we use that line of logic, there are bills that we send to the Senate quite regularly that we would not send because of a belief that the Senate won't take up these bills. So I don't buy into that logic. But I do believe that we should give the Senate an opportunity to do its job. It ought to have that opportunity.

Remember now, this is not about Mueller, this is about bigotry emanating from the Presidency. This is about having the country, by and through its representatives, go on record in terms of where we stand in this time of challenge and controversy as it relates to bigotry emanating from the Presidency.

Impeachment is something that we all should respect because it is constitutional. It is what the Constitution permits. It is also what I believe I have a duty to bring before the Congress. I will do so.

I don't guarantee more than one vote, and that is my vote. There are people who seem to think that if they can convince me, that the people who voted for it previously won't be voting for it this time. That the people who voted for it previously, they have changed their minds, they are going to be against you. They are not against me. I am not against them. I say to them, vote your conscience. Stand where your convictions are now.

But there are people who seem to think that by convincing me that I will be alone, that somehow this will cause me not to act. My dear brothers and sisters, how you have underestimated me. My dear brothers and sisters, I didn't come here to go along so that I could get along and move along. My dear brothers and sisters, you have grossly underestimated me.

If I stand alone and there is but one vote cast, I assure you that one vote will be cast and I will stand alone. I understand that in the eons to come, people will look back on this time and they will query what was wrong with them. What was wrong with them? How could they tolerate an unfit person holding the highest office in the land? How could they tolerate it? They will want to know what was wrong with them.

But I also know this. They will see that there was at least one person who stood on the ground of righteousness,

who put the moral imperative above political expediency.

And I will know also that the world will know where this country stands on the issue of bigotry. I didn't come here to manage bigotry. That is what we do. We always want to get back to bigotry as usual after it rears its ugly head. Let's put that head down and get back to bigotry as usual. Let it be covert, but not overt.

My guess is some people have said to the President: Mr. President, you can do all of these things without displaying your bigotry. They didn't say it that way, but they probably tried to convince him. You don't have to be raw. Do it the way others have done it and you will be appreciated.

I don't want to get back to bigotry as usual. I think we send a message to the world when we impeach a President for bigotry and policy, and that is what I am talking about: bigotry and policy. Not just his words—I don't think that we ought to have a bigot in office, but not just his words—but for what his words have been transformed into, what they have metamorphosed into: bigotry and policy.

I think that we would send a positive message to the world in terms of where we stand, and we would also send a message to many of the people in this country as to how much we care about them, those who suffer from bigotry on a daily basis. If you take out the head bigot, you will send a message to the bigots along the way at the lower end of the ladder.

Now, about the people who are suffering; they have elected us time and time again, many of them, on the belief that this time they are going to take up racism. This time they are going to take up homophobia, xenophobia, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and nativism. This time they are going to take up the issues that impact my life on a daily basis. Yes, it is still here. The glass ceiling exists because of bigotry. There is a glass ceiling. Yes, it is still here.

There are people who have jobs of color and they have to train persons of a different hue to take the job that they have and become their supervisor. It still happens. It is still occurring in the United States of America. The country I love, by the way.

You can love your country and want to see it improve. That is what all of these bills are about here. Everybody that is filing a bill wants to improve the country. That is all I want to do, too. The unfortunate circumstance for a good many people is I want to deal with an issue that we have, for too long, placed on the back burner of our contemporary agenda. I am going to place it on the front burner. There will be a vote.

How do you know there will be a vote? Well, the rules allow it. The rules allow any Member of this august body to come forward with a privileged resolution.

Now, if you want to change the rules, you can do so. Republicans didn't do it

when they were in control of the House. But you can do it. Let's let history show that because one Democrat wanted to bring articles of impeachment, that a Democratic Party did what a Republican Party did not do. Let history reflect that. Change the rules. You have to live with the history. I don't. I am going to be on the right side of the history.

Now, someone would say: But, Al, you will be on the wrong side of politics. Do you know what? The people that I know suffered, the people who lived and died so that I could have this opportunity, the people who found out what a billy club hits like, found out what a 90-pound German Shepherd bites like, found out what a high pressure water hose stings like, the people who lost loved ones to a cause so that I could have this opportunity, I don't know that they want me to be on the right side of politics. I think they want me to be on the right side of history. But I also believe that they want me to be on the right side of this moral issue of our time, and that is whether we will tolerate bigotry emanating from the Presidency.

So to everyone, understand this is not going to be about obstruction of justice. I came to the floor and called that to the attention of the country. There is evidence to move forward on obstruction of justice, but I choose not to do so. It is not going to be about conspiracy. There is evidence, but I choose not to do so.

This is going to be about bigotry, and it is going to be about where do you stand? The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy? Where do you stand when bigotry is the issue that you have to vote on?

And to all of my colleagues, I want you to know I love you. It doesn't matter what side of the aisle you are on. I respect you. And I only say to you, vote your conscience. Decide what side of bigotry, what side of history, what side of righteousness you are going to be on.

I know where I will stand. I will hold my head up high, notwithstanding all of the slings and arrows that are going to come against me. They are coming. They are going to demean me in every way. My mother probably wouldn't know who I am when they are done with me. I understand it.

Gandhi gave us the formula. First they ignore you. These are the words of Gandhi. Then they laugh at you. Then after they have ignored you and they have had a moment of laughter and they see that you are not going away, then they fight you. Then they demean you. I understand.

So do what you may. Say what you may. But I know, within me, that I am doing the right thing.

I know that Gandhi is right. He said that after they have ignored you, after they have laughed and had their mo-

ment of pleasure about it, then they fight you, but then, Gandhi reminded us, then you win.

I am prepared to suffer through until victory. I won't give out. To quote my good friend, Mr. LEWIS, who crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday, "I won't give up. I won't give in." I will do that which my ancestors call upon me to do. I pray to God that this House will vote its conscience. Vote your convictions.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, 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. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELGADO, 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, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER

of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCADAMS, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 5. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and 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. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 1704. A bill to foster commercial relations with foreign countries and support