

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, today in America, women still make only \$0.80, on average, for every dollar a man makes, and that disparity is even greater for women of color.

Women are the sole or co-breadwinners in two-thirds of American families with children. When we pay women less, we hurt American families, and we hurt our economy.

The pay gap isn't a myth. It is math. For a woman working full time, the current wage gap represents a loss of more than \$400,000 over the course of her career.

Tomorrow, the House of Representatives has a real opportunity to tell women in America that they deserve equal pay for equal work. Tomorrow, we can send a message that when women succeed, America succeeds.

Let's bring America into the 21st century. Let's pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

#### DO THE RIGHT THING

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to speak openly to my friends and colleagues. Take a moment to look to your right as you come into this body, to the memorial that was put together by the Parkland students and other gun victims. It will pain your heart and move you to action.

It acknowledges that 722 people die every week from gun violence. It acknowledges that teenagers may lose their lives, and it has a form to indicate which teenager is next. It has flowers, and it says, "Stop killing us."

Every Member of Congress should walk by that memorial today, commit themselves to be decent and do decent things, and recognize that we should have gun safety legislation.

I rise as well to say that women who are not being paid or who are supporting families need the paycheck legislation that I will be supporting tomorrow.

I also say that this country must not accept behavior by a President as a norm, and the Mueller report and the facts must be had. We must do it quietly and respectfully, and we must have our hearings to tell the truth.

Finally, I am outraged, coming from a State that was a poster child for the persons without healthcare, that this administration would try to oppose the Affordable Care Act. We are going to fight it. We are going to try to save the lives of our children and provide healthcare for all.

#### TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 18, 2019, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of March 18, 2019, at page H2750.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), the ranking member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the veto message of the President of the United States to the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 46.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, we will vote to override the President's veto of Congress' bipartisan action to terminate his so-called national emergency declaration. The bottom line is that this emergency declaration is nothing more than an end run around a majority, a bipartisan majority, of both the House and the Senate, in complete disregard of our constitutional system of separation of powers.

There is no doubt that we have a broken immigration system, and comprehensive reform should be a subject of congressional deliberation. But today, in particular, we have a new crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis, but the President has said that this wall will solve that problem.

He also says that this is about drugs. Well, let's talk about that, if we could.

Here we have walls that are static. It is very old technology that has been used for many centuries, as we know. Most recently, when the French built the Maginot Line, the Germans went around it in 24 hours, similar to what the President is proposing. He wants a wall on part of the border.

If the problem were people illegally crossing, they would cross in other areas where there is no wall, but that is actually not the case. He says that this will stop the flood of people who are coming to the border. These are not the historic people who were crossing the border legally to come to the United States for the purposes of work and to remit funds home or those who were illegally smuggling drugs through remote areas. This is a humanitarian crisis.

This is recently in Tijuana, a photo of a flood of people coming to actually two areas where we have walls and fences, wanting to surrender to the Border Patrol and claim asylum, or coming to places where we don't have walls and fences, searching for Border Patrol agents so they can claim asylum.

A wall is going to do nothing to deal with the humanitarian crisis, and we need to take a much more thoughtful approach to that.

Secondly, he says it is about drugs. He makes a big deal about this contributing to the deaths in the opioid crisis, fentanyl, and all that. Of course, the Chinese are shipping in fentanyl in other ways. It is not coming across the Mexican border. Maybe we ought to do something about that.

We have tried with walls to prevent the smuggling of drugs. The drug smugglers are very creative. They have used rather primitive devices. That is a catapult. They have used drones. They frequently use tunnels.

We found out, in the trial of El Chapo Guzman, that their preferred route is not some remote area that is unwallled but, actually, to come across at the legal border crossings here. It is such a big business, they can modify a semi tractor-trailer, put in a fake floor, and send 10 in a day. We only inspect 1 out of 10. Therefore, they get nine through. They lose one truck, millions of dollars' worth of drugs in a truck, and they don't care. It is a multimillion-dollar business.

We need new tools and technology at the legal border crossings. In particular, we need that so we can scan 100 percent of the vehicles. We are going to have to reconfigure the border crossings. We have to bring in the equipment. We have to hire more personnel. These are very expensive undertakings.

Instead, we are going to waste money on a static wall, which isn't going to stop the drugs. Even more than that, the former Commandant of the Coast Guard testified that they have actionable intelligence, they think, on about 80 percent of the maritime drug shipments targeting the U.S., mostly from Central America, some from other Asia-Pacific areas.

They can only act on one-fifth of the actionable intelligence because they don't have the personnel. They don't have the ships. They don't have the helicopters. They don't have the tools they need to interdict those maritime drug shipments.