



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2019

No. 70

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PHILLIPS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 30, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DEAN PHILLIPS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTER FOR ANIMAL REFERRAL AND EMERGENCY SERVICES AND DR. MARTHA LOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a veterinary clinic and dedicated doctor in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, both doing their part to protect the health of service dogs in our community.

Service dogs greatly assist members of our community in innumerable

ways, providing companionship, helping individuals with special needs, and serving as therapy dogs.

Recognizing their importance, Dr. Martha Low of the Center for Animal Referral and Emergency Services, also known as CARES, is offering free eye exams to service dogs. These critical exams protect the eyesight of these animals and allow them to work in nursing homes, schools, and other facilities where their services are needed.

I extend my sincerest appreciation to CARES and to Dr. Low. Organized by the American College of Veterinary Ophthalmologists, Dr. Low is one of over 300 doctors who perform this work throughout the United States. We are so grateful for all their work and their service to our community.

RECOGNIZING THE DOMINIC LIPLIS SCHOLARSHIP FUND

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary family and community from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that is working to make our community a better place.

Earlier this month, Ciarlo Liplis threw out the first pitch at the baseball game between Central Bucks West and Pennridge high schools. Ciarlo is the brother of Dominic Liplis, an 8-year-old boy who tragically succumbed to brain cancer in 2016.

Ciarlo and his family have since developed a close bond with the CB West team and our entire community. The Liplis family has turned their tragedy and grief into strength.

Working with this team, the family helped establish the Dominic Liplis Scholarship Fund to award the senior baseball player who represents Dominic's positive attitude and ability.

I applaud the Central Bucks High School West team. We wish them all continued success this season.

I would also like to extend all our gratitude to the Liplis family and give Ciarlo and his parents, Ken and Kira, our heartfelt thanks on behalf of everybody in our community.

RECOGNIZING BOWEN'S BARBER SHOP

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a small business in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for helping kids in our community.

Bowen's Barber Shop in Newtown recently teamed up with the Bucks County Intermediate Unit to give five young men with special needs haircuts for their prom. In addition to their haircuts, these students got the ability to interact and independently communicate with their barber, giving them real-world experience and confidence.

Bowen's has been a longstanding, respected business in Newtown, and I appreciate their contributions to our community.

I thank the owner of Bowen's, Tracey Bowen, for her generosity.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to Merri Kurman and the Bucks County Intermediate Unit transition program for their work in empowering individuals with special needs.

Our community thanks each and every one of these individuals and organizations.

BRING ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I love my country.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a document styled "Report on the Investigation into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election," Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because this Congress has a date with destiny. Mr. Speaker, the tintinnabulation of history are sounding. The bells of history are reminding us that we have a responsibility to our country that we must take up.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to announce that I will bring Articles of Impeachment

☐ 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.

H3307

against the President of the United States of America for obstructing a lawful investigation. I do so, Mr. Speaker, because I will not put party above people; I will not put politics above principle; and I will not put this President above the law.

Mr. Speaker, I don't do this because I want to. I do so because I have to. We cannot allow the paralysis of analysis to thwart the obstruction of justice cause that must be brought before the Congress. This is a day that we all must start now to decide what our votes will be because history demands that we all take a stand.

I have not lobbied one person and will not do so. I say to people: Vote your conscience. But if you have read this document, there are a good many people who will conclude that the President has obstructed a lawful investigation.

Mr. Speaker, there are people who cannot say that I was right when I said some 600-plus days ago that the President was engaging in obstruction, and they will not say that I was wrong. But to those people who can't say that I am wrong and will not say that I am right, you know that I kept my word every step of the way, and I am going to keep my word today.

If this House does not bring these Articles of Impeachment before this august body, each Member has the authority and the opportunity to do so. I will not allow history to show that this Congress did not take a vote on the impeachment of a reckless, ruthless, lawless President.

I absolutely believe that we must honor our date with history.

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

RECOGNIZING RICE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rice Elementary School for being authorized to teach the Primary Years Program as an International Baccalaureate World School.

The International Baccalaureate program takes an interdisciplinary approach, allowing children to learn and collaborate in the classroom. This program provides a unique learning experience to students, expanding their horizons and teaching them about our larger world beyond our own borders.

I congratulate the teachers and administrators at Rice Elementary. I thank them for always going above and beyond for their students and their families.

I am proud to recognize Rice Elementary School as a leader in education in our great State of Minnesota, the Education State, and in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District.

Congratulations again to the teachers, administrators, and most importantly, the students and their families.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRED CHIEF PETTY OFFICER ALAN DIX

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor retired Chief Petty Officer Alan Dix from Elk River, Minnesota, for his service to our country.

After serving 24 years in the Navy and being stationed in Iraq, he continues to serve in our community. Chief Petty Officer Dix is responsible for creating the Spirit of Minnesota Tribute Bell.

In partnership with Wells Fargo, Alan and the Minnesota Assistance Council for Veterans led the effort to create the Tribute Bell to thank and honor our servicemembers and veterans for their sacrifices to our great Nation.

Alan currently serves as the chair of the Minnesota Veterans Team Members Network, which is part of the Minnesota Assistance Council for Veterans. The council helps veterans and their families access employment, housing, and legal assistance.

Through this organization, Alan made the Spirit of Minnesota Tribute Bell a reality. The bell embodies the symbolism of respect that our community has toward our military. Because of their courage and valor, we are safer and stronger as a country.

We are thankful for Alan. He reminds us of how important it is to remember and honor those who gave so much to our Nation.

His service and all of his work on behalf of our veterans and their families is greatly appreciated.

RECOGNIZING MITCH EICKHOFF, 2019 SAUK RAPIDS CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mitch Eickhoff for being named the 2019 Sauk Rapids Citizen of the Year. Mitch is a lifelong resident of Sauk Rapids and the Sauk Rapids community. He is also a lifelong public servant.

Through his foundation, FGHC Active, Mitch raises money by organizing 5K runs and other community events for organizations like the Sauk Rapids Fire Department, Tanner's Team Foundation, and Anna Marie's Alliance.

Mitch's charitable efforts also extend well beyond the borders of Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District and the State of Minnesota. Mitch has raised money to support the Burn Violence Survivors—Nepal, which helps with the recovery process for burn victims in South Asia. He has also supported communities in Malawi, Africa, raising money for healthcare, education, and the environment.

Mitch's work to serve people in our community and beyond deserves recognition. Our district and our constituents all benefit from his passion to serve others.

I thank Mitch for making an exceptional impact on our community.

RIGHTEOUS AMONG THE NATIONS RECOGNITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, a day before Yom HaShoah, or Holocaust Remembrance Day, to recognize the late Cornelis and Wilhelmina de Ru.

In 1940, Nazi forces invaded the Netherlands, and days later, the Dutch were forced to surrender. Throughout the next 5 years, the de Ru family risked everything to save the life of a young Jewish teenager, Maurits Kopuit. He was only one of two survivors in his family.

The de Rus understood the great risk involved in shielding Maurits, yet they displayed unyielding courage in their effort to save a fellow citizen.

During the Holocaust, the Nazis systematically killed 6 million Jews. However, throughout this nightmare, there were a few like the de Rus who refused to allow dark forces to prevail.

This past Sunday, Mr. and Mrs. de Ru were named Righteous Among the Nations for their heroic efforts to protect Mr. Maurits Kopuit from the Nazi regime during World War II.

Righteous Among the Nations is a special designation by Yad Vashem, the World Holocaust Remembrance Center, that conveys the gratitude of the State of Israel and of the Jewish people for those who took risks to save Jews during the Holocaust.

As of January 2018, Yad Vashem had recognized over 26,000 people from 51 different countries with the Righteous Among the Nations designation. Their names appear on the Mount of Remembrance in Jerusalem. It is an unprecedented tribute by victims to those who stood by their sides.

Next week marks the 74th anniversary of the Nazi army's surrender. We must never forget the consequences of remaining silent in the face of evil and intolerance.

Please join me in honoring the de Rus' selfless actions and commemorating all those whose lives were lost.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STAN SMITH

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the late Stan Smith, an exemplary historian from Rancho Bernardo whose help made the San Diego Veterans History Project possible.

Stan's brother, Charlie, was killed during the invasion of Sicily in 1943 during World War II. This prompted Stan himself to join the U.S. Navy and later prompted his interest in recording veterans' accounts of their service during World War II and the Vietnam war.

Stan began helping my office in 2013 and worked with us for 3 years before going to help the San Diego Veterans Museum.

□ 1015

He recorded more than 100 oral histories of San Diego County veterans in

the 7 years since he began, ensuring that their stories would never be forgotten.

Stan understood the importance of passing history down from one generation to the next and thanking the men and women who, like Stan, served our country.

We are deeply grateful for Stan Smith's commitment to recording veterans' stories. His work has ensured that their stories will never be lost. Please join me in honoring Stan Smith and his children, who plan to carry on the work their father started.

Mr. Speaker, if there are any San Diegans who are interested in becoming involved with the Veterans History Project, I hope they will contact my office.

CONGRATULATING RESMED

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate ResMed, a medical device company located in my district, for receiving the 2019 Duane Roth Renaissance Award.

Duane Roth was a champion of life sciences and tech entrepreneurship. He was a beloved community leader who defined San Diego's innovation ecosystem and economic diversity.

Every year, the Duane Roth Award is given to a company whose inventions and breakthroughs have improved the world around us. ResMed has combined groundbreaking sleep and respiratory medicine with technology to increase the accessibility and availability of treatment for those with sleep apnea and other chronic diseases. This year, ResMed is recognized for its commitment to improving quality of life, reducing the risk of chronic disease, and increasing access to healthcare.

ResMed exemplifies the innovation and discovery of San Diego, and I am proud to celebrate a San Diego company that has worked tirelessly to better healthcare on this well-deserved honor.

DANIEL DESNOYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the sad story of Daniel Desnoyers, who took his own life because he did not have the money to buy the basic drugs that he needed for his mental health issues.

Daniel Desnoyers was a young man who struggled with depression and psychosis, mental health issues that show no physical symptoms but take a deep psychological toll on those whom they afflict.

Daniel did the right thing. He purchased health insurance through the New York health insurance marketplace from Fidelis, a subsidiary of massive international conglomerate Centene Corporation.

In March, Daniel went to the pharmacy to refill his prescription for risperidone, an antipsychotic medication that he needed. He was informed

by the pharmacy that he no longer had health insurance and the 1-month refill would cost him \$250.

Now, to some people, \$250 may not seem like a lot of money, but to Daniel it was. According to a 2018 study by the Federal Reserve, 40 percent of Americans would not be able to cover an unexpected \$400 expense. Daniel, unfortunately, was one of them.

So he did not buy the medicine, and he began to ration his antipsychotic medicine, taking it every other day until he could get his insurance back. He contacted his provider, Fidelis, at the beginning of April when he learned that they had canceled his plan because he missed a \$20 payment.

Fidelis didn't immediately reinstate the plan. Instead, the company informed him that his coverage would not resume until May 1. This meant another month without a refill of his prescription, another month without the medicine Daniel needed to function. His ration of medicine had run out.

On April 9, filled with thoughts of suicide—a listed side effect for antipsychotic drug withdrawal—Daniel superglued his seatbelt shut, posted a farewell message on Facebook, and drove his truck into the river, ending his life.

Daniel Desnoyers died at the age of 29 because he was late paying \$20 to a corporation that pulled in more than \$60 billion in 2018.

Something is deeply wrong in this country where we let a young man die because he cannot afford medicine that he needs and when his insurance is taken away because of a \$20 missed payment. Daniel died because we have a system that puts profits over patients.

A healthcare system that does not guarantee basic care for all people is a healthcare system that is broken. Medicare for All could have prevented Daniel's death, and it could prevent the death of so many others. LLOYD DOGGETT's pharmaceutical bill that would hold these pharmaceutical companies accountable could have prevented Daniel's death.

Twenty-eight million Americans are still uninsured, and millions more are saddled with high deductibles and high premium plans which lead them to forgo the care they need. Medicare for All is the plan that will guarantee every American the basic care that they have a right to.

Daniel Desnoyers wasn't a perfect man and he didn't lead a perfect life, but he tried, and our Nation owes it to him and others like him to make sure that they have the medicine they need to live with dignity.

I will continue to fight for Daniel, for his father, for his family, and for all Americans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. LEE of Nevada) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Hardy Kim, Sunnyvale Presbyterian Church, Sunnyvale, California, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, we give You thanks for this day filled with vibrant life, proving Your ongoing care for all creation.

We thank You for the Members of this House, for the gifts they bear, the communities they represent, and the varied spiritual journeys that have formed them. Grant each of them understanding of Your divine truth, that they might wisely lead us along paths of righteousness.

Remind us all today to do justice, love kindness, and to walk humbly before You. Moreover, bless the leaders in this diverse gathering. By them, make our Nation one body, ready to do Your will—with eyes to look upon the suffering in compassion, voices to speak love and affirmation to the dehumanized, hands and feet to go out and establish Your peace and justice for all, not just a few.

Offering ourselves and these prayers into Your divine care, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND HARDY KIM

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to introduce today's guest chaplain, the Reverend

Hardy Kim of Sunnyvale Presbyterian Church, which is in my district.

Since 1956, Sunnyvale Presbyterian Church has stood for peace and justice in Silicon Valley. Pastor Kim began his service there 2 years ago, hoping to unite our diverse community and deliver spiritual comfort to the least fortunate.

His work is important for those families struggling to find affordable housing and keep up with the rising cost of living often overlooked in Silicon Valley's soaring wealth.

He also is an immigrant success story. He came here with his parents from South Korea to Detroit and later received a bachelor's degree from Harvard and a law degree from the University of Michigan. After a year as a Presbyterian mission volunteer in Belfast, Northern Ireland, he felt called to church ministry.

I have been honored to participate in dialogues he has led in the community on immigration and gun control. I have learned a lot from him about history. He recently told me that our separation of powers—such an important concept today—is inspired in part by the Presbyterian Church, and that one of my favorite Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, apparently remarked that the highest honor of his life was not being President of the United States, but it was being an elder in the Presbyterian Church.

Pastor Kim has become a reliable and trusted voice in Silicon Valley. I am very proud to introduce him to the House and honored that he would grace us with the opening prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

POWAY SHOOTING

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, as members of our Jewish community in San Diego and all over the world observed the final day of Passover, a 19-year-old chose hate. He stormed into the Chabad of Poway synagogue, shooting at the congregation, leaving beloved community member Lori Gilbert Kaye dead and three more wounded.

The congregation's brave rabbi, Yisroel Goldstein, reflected: "I do not know why I had to witness scenes of a pogrom in San Diego County like the ones my grandparents experienced in Poland. . . . I don't know why I had to see my good friend . . . hunted in her house of worship."

This Thursday, Madam Speaker, is Israel's Yom HaShoah, a day to commemorate the Holocaust and the 6 mil-

lion Jews who were murdered for being Jewish.

We are reminded of the hate, bigotry, and intolerance that we continue to face today, whether it be in San Diego, Sri Lanka, Christchurch, or Pittsburgh.

Hate and violence had no place then and still do not today. We need to say "never again" and act.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and legacy of a truly great Hoosier who dedicated his life to making the world a better and safer place for generations to come. Senator Richard Lugar passed away over the weekend, with his dear family by his side, at the age of 78.

The Richard G. Lugar Plaza in Indianapolis is just one tribute to the truly great statesman and public servant role model he was to so many people, including to myself. He served our Navy proudly. He was the mayor of Indianapolis and the longest tenured Member of Congress from Indiana.

He worked brilliantly and in a bipartisan fashion not only on security issues but also compassionately on those issues that impacted Americans every day, including food security both at home and around the globe, education for young people, energy independence, and free trade. He skillfully navigated foreign policy matters and earned a Medal of Freedom for successfully convincing the former Soviet Union to dismantle their weapons at the end of the Cold War.

No matter the topic at hand, he always made time for the next generation, to teach and inspire young Hoosiers to serve their country and to remind all of us that we have more in common as Americans than we do differences.

We will miss his wisdom and his gentle smile dearly, but his legacy will endure for generations to come.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, this week, the House will pass major legislation to reassert America's leadership on climate change.

America's leadership on this issue cannot be more urgent and needed. The current administration has ignored the consensus of scientists and the need to act in a responsible manner.

Nearly 50 years ago on the first Earth Day, tens of millions of Americans demanded change from their government. Later that year, seven major pieces of legislation were signed into law—the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act—with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Last week was Earth Day, and I saw firsthand that my community of western New York continues to lead to confront this challenge. With students finding ways to reduce the carbon footprint, Re-Tree Western New York celebrated 30,000 new tree plantings, and the Western New York Land Conservancy is preserving green space for generations to come.

Now Congress needs to follow this example and restore America's leadership role on the environment.

MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Month of the Military Child. I married the daughter of an Army retired combat veteran. She was born just after her father got to Vietnam. My children are, of course, military children.

Several years ago, I was on a friend's Facebook page. He had died fighting for our country in Afghanistan. The last post on his Facebook page read: "I love you and miss you . . . Daddy."

Her dad had signed up to go to war, but she never did.

Who will teach her to dance?

Who will drop her off at college?

Who will walk that young girl down the aisle?

Our military children's sacrifices can never be properly measured and never compensated, but we must do all we can to honor them.

GOODNESS IN ACTION IN TUCSON, ARIZONA

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I am standing here today to recognize my southern Arizona community. While in Tucson for the work period, I saw goodness in action. The city of Tucson, the county, Catholic Community Services, and other local churches and nonprofits came together with open arms and hearts to welcome and care for the hundreds of families seeking asylum across our southern border.

With limited resources and fleeting time, southern Arizonans stepped up to provide shelter, transportation, food, clothing, and childcare. City volunteers ran with little children who hadn't played in weeks and weeks.

The families fleeing their birthplace journeyed to the United States for a safer and better life for their children. Their stories are gut-wrenching, and the response I have seen and heard from the Tucson community has been unparalleled.

No walls or cages, I saw goodness in action. We must come together like Tucson to find humane and proactive solutions to help these families.

HONORING LIAM MAGATHAN

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

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in honor of Liam Magathan of Meriden, Kansas, whom I awarded last week the Silver Congressional Award Medal.

Liam is a student at the University of Kansas. Through years of hard work, dedication, and personal sacrifice, Liam has achieved this prestigious honor.

I want to let Liam know how much I look up to him and how the world would be a better place if more people were like him.

Keep up the good work, my friend. You are bringing pride upon yourself, Kansas, and the United States of America.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF
REVEREND HOWARD HAYWOOD

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join Myrtle Baptist Church, the Newton community, and the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts in mourning the loss of Reverend Howard Haywood.

A little over a year ago, I walked into Myrtle Baptist with my family, and Reverend Haywood welcomed us with a warm embrace that few could match. It was that physical, emotional embrace that countless congregants and visitors will never forget.

With eight generations of his family calling Newton home, the reverend liked to talk about how the city shaped him. If anything, our city stands kinder, stronger, and more just because of him.

A journeyman bricklayer and construction worker for five decades, he literally built Massachusetts into what it is today. Yet he still felt like he had more to offer, so he spent the little free time he found fighting for affordable housing and civil rights for his fellow citizens.

To his wife, Katy; his daughter, Kristen; his son, Howard, Jr.; and the entire Haywood family, please know how grateful we are that you shared this magnificent man with all of us.

□ 1215

RISING FOR LORI SMITH AND
COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise for Lori Smith of Pennsylvania, a member of my community who passed away last month after a very long and hard-fought battle with stage IV colorectal cancer.

When she first received her diagnosis, Lori learned that several of the symp-

toms that she had been experiencing had been there for over a decade. So, Lori stood up. She harnessed the power of social media and advocacy to share her story with the world, to stand up and fight for her life and the lives of all those affected by this insidious disease.

We met with Lori's husband, Kenny, here in Washington to hear of her brave fight and of their tireless work to make sure that other families never have to go through the pain that they went through.

That was March 19. Lori passed away on March 20.

I refuse to let Lori's death and the thousands of cancer-related deaths go unnoticed. I cosponsored H.R. 1570, the Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, which would waive Medicare's cost-sharing requirements for preventive screening of colonoscopies.

I urge the House and the Senate to pass this bipartisan and lifesaving legislation.

As we continue to search for a cure, the greatest tool at our disposal is always early diagnosis. No one in our country should ever have to forego lifesaving screenings.

And to all my fellow Americans battling cancer, I will not stop fighting for you.

STAGGERING COST OF INSULIN

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the staggering cost of insulin.

A study published last September estimated that manufacturers could charge between \$7 and \$11 for insulin and still make a profit. In reality, Madam Speaker, the list price today is \$275 a vial.

This is an unconscionable markup on a critical, lifesaving drug, as diabetes is the primary cause of death for 85,000 Americans each and every year.

While insurance covers some of the costs, insulin is, all too often, unaffordable for the 17,000 Medicare beneficiaries in my district who depend on it to survive. That is because it can cost a senior on Medicare living in my hometown over \$1,400 a year to pay for their diabetes medication.

To combat this issue, I introduced the Insulin Access for All Act. My legislation ensures that Medicare and Medicaid recipients pay nothing out of pocket for their insulin.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in reducing the cost of insulin for all Americans.

TEENAGE SUICIDE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor of helping an American

citizen familiarize herself with our United States Capitol—with her United States Capitol. Sophia is here with her eighth grade class from St. Philip The Apostle Catholic School in Pasadena, California.

I felt it important for her to understand that we do listen, so I asked her before I gave this speech: What comes to mind? What issue would you like me to mention?

She thought, and she thought, and she said: Teenage suicide rates are way too high.

You had better believe it, America. They are. And there are many things we can do, both locally and here in Washington, to make sure that we curtail that and make sure that young people don't find themselves in the position to do such a thing to themselves, their family, and their community.

I pledged to Sophia that many of us here in Washington are committed to doing what we can to make sure that suicide rates in general, but specifically suicide rates amongst young people, are curtailed and they hopefully stop and come down to zero soon.

I thank Sophia for visiting us, and I thank her teachers and all of those who brought her here today.

THANKING USO FOR ITS COMMITMENT TO AMERICAN SERVICE-MEMBERS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the USO is on Capitol Hill today for a service project where volunteers can assemble care packages for servicemembers who are currently deployed.

More than 2,000 care packages will be assembled today as part of the Force Behind the Forces campaign.

The USO strengthens America's military servicemembers by keeping them connected to family, home, and country throughout their service to the Nation.

The USO has more than 200 locations around the globe. It serves 4.9 million Active-Duty Guard, Reserve, and members of their families.

For more than 75 years, the USO has been by the side of America's military servicemembers. From the moment they join, through their assignments and deployments, and as they transition back to their communities, the USO has been there.

The USO has delivered more than 2.6 million care packages since the Care Package Program was established in 2003. In 2018, the USO delivered 120,000 care packages to servicemembers across the globe.

Madam Speaker, I thank the USO for its dedication to our servicemembers and their families. As a military family, as an individual who has visited theaters of war, I see what a difference this makes, and I thank them for their service.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, climate change is already exacting a dramatic toll: extreme weather, unprecedented migration, and untold suffering.

Meanwhile, the administration denies basic science, and President Trump wants to pull the United States out of the Paris Agreement.

But the American people—and the world—reject this approach. As Pope Francis has written: “We must regain the conviction that we need one another, that we have a shared responsibility for others and the world, and that being good and decent are worth it.”

When everyone from the Pope to the Pentagon warns us that we are in a crisis, it is clearly time to act.

This week we consider H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. This legislation will keep us in the Paris Agreement, along with more than 180 other countries; require the President to develop real emissions plans; and recommit the United States to global climate leadership.

My eldest son and daughter are expecting a child, and I have a 7-year-old granddaughter. I want them to know clean air and pure water.

I also want them to understand that we did everything we could to protect this wondrous planet for them and for generations to come.

I thank Representative CASTOR for her leadership, and I urge Members to support the bill.

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.

ENCOURAGING GREATER PUBLIC-PRIVATE SECTOR COLLABORATION TO PROMOTE FINANCIAL LITERACY FOR STUDENTS AND YOUNG ADULTS.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 327) encouraging greater public-private sector collaboration to promote financial literacy for students and young adults, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 327

Whereas personal financial literacy is essential to ensuring that individuals are prepared to make informed decisions about

budgeting, financial planning, wealth accumulation, higher education loans, 529 savings plans, managing credit cards, and managing other debt;

Whereas often young people are ill-equipped to handle major financial decisions in an increasingly complex financial marketplace;

Whereas personal financial management skills begin to develop during childhood;

Whereas, according to the report of the Girl Scout Research Institute entitled “Having it All: Girls and Financial Literacy”, only 12 percent of girls feel very confident about making financial decisions;

Whereas the move away from traditional pensions and toward defined contribution plans requires more financial education, so workers need to be equipped with the financial aptitude to not only save and accumulate assets, but also to turn those assets into lifetime income;

Whereas the Council for Economic Education found that only 22 States require high schools to offer some type of personal finance course and only 17 States require that course for high school graduation;

Whereas a longitudinal research study by the University of Arizona found that high school and college students who have been exposed to ongoing financial education show an increase in financial knowledge;

Whereas the 2015 National Financial Capability Study, developed in consultation with the Department of the Treasury and President’s Advisory Council on Financial Capability, updates key measures from the 2009 National Financial Capability Study of American adults and deepens the exploration of topics that are highly relevant today, including student loans and medical debt;

Whereas the Federal Reserve System offers publications in English and Spanish that provide consumers tips on a broad range of topics, from avoiding mortgage foreclosure scams to managing a checking account;

Whereas a study conducted by Daniel Fernandes, John G. Lynch, Jr., and Richard Netemeyer entitled “Financial Literacy, Financial Education and Downstream Financial Behaviors” found that it “is best to provide assistance just before a decision is made in what is known as ‘just-in-time education’”; and

Whereas on September 6, 2018, the U.S. House of Representatives passed, by a vote of 406 to 4, H.R. 1635, the Empowering Students Through Enhanced Financial Counseling Act, which helps improve financial aid counseling for students receiving a Pell Grant or a Federal loan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) emphasizes the importance of raising awareness of individual financial capability by providing relevant information, financial workshops, and other decision-making tools to consumers of all ages;

(2) supports the efforts of Federal financial agencies to partner with organizations that are focused on developing opportunities for minorities and women to place talented young minorities and women in industry internships, summer employment, and full-time positions;

(3) supports the efforts of the Federal financial agencies to provide consumers with relevant information and decision-making tools regarding important financial decisions; and

(4) urges the Department of the Treasury to consult with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority and implement future national financial capability studies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and the gentleman

from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 327, a bipartisan resolution we introduced in April in honor of Financial Literacy Month.

I would like to start by thanking my friend Congressman FRENCH HILL from Arkansas, who should truly be considered as an original cosponsor of this resolution for working on this legislation with me.

The aim of this resolution is simple but important. It encourages collaboration between the public and private sector to promote financial literacy for students. It emphasizes the importance of financial literacy for consumers of all ages, and it supports efforts of Federal agencies to expand financial education resources.

This year alone, approximately 15.1 million students will be in grades 9 through 12 and almost 20 million students will be enrolled in colleges and universities.

That is a lot of young people who will soon be entering a complex financial marketplace where they will have to quickly make important financial decisions. These include decisions about paying for college, credit cards, financing a car or a home purchase, preparing for unexpected emergencies, and saving for retirement.

However, without an understanding of basic financial concepts, these young people will not be well equipped to make these decisions.

At a time when student loan balances stand at \$1.5 trillion and a majority of private workers have access to defined contribution plans and not traditional pension benefits, it is even more important for young people and workers to be financially literate.

Part of the problem is that too few schools incorporate financial education into their curriculum. According to the Council for Economic Education, only a third of States require high school students to take a course in personal finance. In those States, most schools teach the subject as one portion of another course of study—such as math, economics, or social studies—while only five States require a semester-long, standalone personal finance course.

Studies show that financial illiteracy carries significant cost. Consumers who fail to understand the concept of

compound interest spend more on transaction fees, run up bigger debts, and incur higher interest rates on loans.

We also need to work on making financial literacy tools available for everyone. Unfortunately, levels of financial literacy are lower among the less educated minorities and women.

Just 19 percent of high school graduates possess basic financial knowledge and skills. Perhaps even more troubling, according to a survey by the Consumer Federation of America and the Financial Planning Association, 21 percent of respondents, including 38 percent of those with income below \$25,000, reported that winning the lottery was “the most practical strategy for accumulating several hundred thousand dollars for their own retirement.”

This is a tragedy in the making, and we can do better.

While Americans are not expected to manage their own legal cases or medical conditions, they are expected to manage their own finances.

We teach our children to wear seat belts. We teach them to say no to drugs. We should also be teaching them the financial literacy skills that they will need to successfully navigate the financial marketplace.

We want to give young people and all consumers the tools they need to survive. One of the ways in which we can do that is by having Federal agencies partner with schools, local and State governments, workplaces, community organizations, nonprofits, and financial service providers.

Whether it is giving students immersive opportunities to see how money and banking work in the real world or helping train and equip teachers with the curriculum and materials they need to succeed in the classroom, Federal agencies should be bold and innovative in their approaches and leverage the ways in which technology can be used to further these laudable goals.

We cannot afford to have future generations of Americans grow up without learning these fundamental skills. For that reason, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Madam Speaker for the opportunity to speak on this important resolution, H. Res. 327, and I want to thank my good friend from Illinois, Dr. FOSTER, for his passion on this measure to benefit, particularly, the young people in this country.

Certainly, as the most prominent Ph.D. in the House of Representatives and a pioneering entrepreneur, he knows the value of financial literacy.

And I am proud, as a former community banker and investment manager, somebody who dealt with families, their kids, and older Americans for 30 years in finance, to partner on this very important promotion of financial literacy for students and young adults.

It is wonderful that it is a bipartisan effort by our committee.

And it is truly unfortunate, Madam Speaker, that only 25 States require high school students to take a financial literacy class in order to graduate. As a result, many children and adolescents grow into adults who don't know how to properly save, spend, and budget.

I am proud that Arkansas is one of those 25 States, Madam Speaker, as we enacted our requirement back in 2005. But, going back even further to 1962, Arkansas, through the leadership of Bessie Moore, a remarkable educator in our State, created something called Economics Arkansas, which, every summer, puts on financial literacy training for all of our teachers, K through 12, so that they understand to put financial literacy in all the classrooms.

It was a lot of fun last week when we were in the district to go to Robinson Senior High School in Little Rock and see them compete for the Stock Market Game, which is a major component in financial literacy training, through Economics Arkansas.

□ 1230

So not everyone, every student is as lucky as an Arkansan, because two-thirds of Americans can't pass a financial literacy test, Madam Speaker. Forty-four percent do not have enough savings to cover a \$400 emergency, and 33 percent have not saved for their retirement.

Financial illiteracy has broader economic costs, higher debt, limited savings. For many, this limits their homeownership. This means they don't have a stable retirement. And for many of our young adults, this critical knowledge creates the burden that we have seen in student loan lending in this country where families are not treating higher education debt as seriously as they treat buying that first house.

Why is that, Madam Speaker? It is because of the lack, in my view, of financial literacy at the high school level, at our admissions offices in colleges, and that is why it was terrific, bipartisan, that this time last year in the last Congress, in September, we passed, with over 400 votes in this House, a measure that requires financial literacy training for students seeking a student loan, for students accepting a Pell grant. That is the kind of good work that this House has been doing.

I want to again thank my friend, Mr. FOSTER, for his work. As we close Financial Literacy Month, I can't think of a better topic, and I can't think of a better friend to share that work with.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The first thing I want to say is thank you to Mr. FOSTER and thank you to Mr. HILL for providing sterling, bipartisan leadership on this, Madam Speaker, what I feel is one of the most pressing needs facing our Nation today, and that is to equip our young people with the financial education, the financial acumen of navigating what is becoming even a greater, more complex financial system.

Madam Speaker, let me just bring this glaring statistic to drive home this point to you, the Congress, and the American people.

According to the Council for Economic Education, just 17 States out of the 50 States of our great Nation require students to take even one course in personal finance. Just 22 States require high school students to take a course in just basic economics, and then that course is interloped into others and not even in and of itself.

Yet the financial decisions that our young people are asked to make are immense, carrying lifelong consequences to consider in the decision, first of all, of whether to go to college or not, how to go to college, how to pay for it, and how to pay for the increasing costly debt for this college education.

Consider the challenges that can come from balancing a starting or beginning wage against the student loan debt or saving for retirement. Or consider many of the basic kitchen table choices that families must make each and every day to put food on the table, to buy or not to buy an automobile, just the simple electricity bill. They would have to make definite choices.

Consider the advantages that are afforded to consumers who do have access to credit, how important that is. How do you acquire that access, and how do you maintain that access for credit?

We are, indeed, a financial consumer economy, but we are basically a credit-based economy, and our young people must gravitate and be able to grapple with this in a responsible way.

In our increasingly complex financial marketplace, the value of financial education has never been higher. Personal education is badly needed.

To reduce debt, we would look at the debt that so many of our young people start out with year after year even finishing college. How do you manage that? How do you make those choices?

Financial literacy is the key to financial security not just of the individual, because if we don't have financial security for the people of our Nation, we don't have financial security for the future of this great Nation. That is why this is one of the most important issues that this Congress faces today.

I am so proud to join with my Republican friend and my Democratic friend in showing the bipartisan way that we must go to solve this problem and make sure that this generation and every generation coming after them have the best financial education.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I have no other speakers on this important matter.

I just want to continue to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and our lead sponsor, Dr. FOSTER, for his thoughtful elevation of the importance of financial literacy for all of our students and their families.

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

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

I would like to again thank my colleague, Congressman HILL, for his assistance in support of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important resolution to show Congress' commitment to ensuring our Nation's students have the essential financial literacy skills they need to thrive and excel in today's economy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 327, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SENIOR INVESTOR INITIATIVE ACT OF 2019

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1876) to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1876

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 "National Senior Investor Initiative Act of 2019" or the "Senior Security Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. SENIOR INVESTOR TASKFORCE.

Section 4 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) SENIOR INVESTOR TASKFORCE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Commission the Senior Investor Taskforce (in this subsection referred to as the 'Taskforce').

"(2) DIRECTOR OF THE TASKFORCE.—The head of the Taskforce shall be the Director, who shall—

"(A) report directly to the Chairman; and

"(B) be appointed by the Chairman, in consultation with the Commission, from among individuals—

"(i) currently employed by the Commission or from outside of the Commission; and

"(ii) having experience in advocating for the interests of senior investors.

"(3) STAFFING.—The Chairman shall ensure that—

"(A) the Taskforce is staffed sufficiently to carry out fully the requirements of this subsection; and

"(B) such staff shall include individuals from the Division of Enforcement, Office of Compliance Inspections and Examinations, and Office of Investor Education and Advocacy.

"(4) MINIMIZING DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.—In organizing and staffing the Taskforce, the Chairman shall take such actions as may be necessary to minimize the duplication of efforts within the divisions and offices described under paragraph (3)(B) and any other divisions, offices, or taskforces of the Commission.

"(5) FUNCTIONS OF THE TASKFORCE.—The Taskforce shall—

"(A) identify challenges that senior investors encounter, including problems associated with financial exploitation and cognitive decline;

"(B) identify areas in which senior investors would benefit from changes in the regulations of the Commission or the rules of self-regulatory organizations;

"(C) coordinate, as appropriate, with other offices within the Commission, other taskforces that may be established within the Commission, self-regulatory organizations, and the Elder Justice Coordinating Council; and

"(D) consult, as appropriate, with State securities and law enforcement authorities, State insurance regulators, and other Federal agencies.

"(6) REPORT.—The Taskforce, in coordination, as appropriate, with the Office of the Investor Advocate and self-regulatory organizations, and in consultation, as appropriate, with State securities and law enforcement authorities, State insurance regulators, and Federal agencies, shall issue a report every 2 years to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, the first of which shall not be issued until after the report described in section 3 of the National Senior Investor Initiative Act of 2019 has been issued and considered by the Taskforce, containing—

"(A) appropriate statistical information and full and substantive analysis;

"(B) a summary of recent trends and innovations that have impacted the investment landscape for senior investors;

"(C) a summary of regulatory initiatives that have concentrated on senior investors and industry practices related to senior investors;

"(D) key observations, best practices, and areas needing improvement, involving senior investors identified during examinations, enforcement actions, and investor education outreach;

"(E) a summary of the most serious issues encountered by senior investors, including issues involving financial products and services;

"(F) an analysis with regard to existing policies and procedures of brokers, dealers, investment advisers, and other market participants related to senior investors and senior investor-related topics and whether these policies and procedures need to be further developed or refined;

"(G) recommendations for such changes to the regulations, guidance, and orders of the Commission and self-regulatory organizations and such legislative actions as may be appropriate to resolve problems encountered by senior investors; and

"(H) any other information, as determined appropriate by the Director of the Taskforce.

"(7) SUNSET.—The Taskforce shall terminate after the end of the 10-year period be-

ginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection, but may be reestablished by the Chairman.

"(8) SENIOR INVESTOR DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'senior investor' means an investor over the age of 65."

SEC. 3. GAO STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and the Senior Investor Taskforce the results of a study of financial exploitation of senior citizens.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include information with respect to—

(1) economic costs of the financial exploitation of senior citizens—

(A) associated with losses by victims that were incurred as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens;

(B) incurred by State and Federal agencies, law enforcement and investigatory agencies, public benefit programs, public health programs, and other public programs as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens;

(C) incurred by the private sector as a result of the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(D) any other relevant costs that—

(i) result from the financial exploitation of senior citizens; and

(ii) the Comptroller General determines are necessary and appropriate to include in order to provide Congress and the public with a full and accurate understanding of the economic costs resulting from the financial exploitation of senior citizens in the United States;

(2) frequency of senior financial exploitation and correlated or contributing factors—

(A) information about percentage of senior citizens financially exploited each year; and

(B) information about factors contributing to increased risk of exploitation, including such factors as race, social isolation, income, net worth, religion, region, occupation, education, home-ownership, illness, and loss of spouse; and

(3) policy responses and reporting of senior financial exploitation—

(A) the degree to which financial exploitation of senior citizens unreported to authorities;

(B) the reasons that financial exploitation may be unreported to authorities;

(C) to the extent that suspected elder financial exploitation is currently being reported—

(i) information regarding which Federal, State, and local agencies are receiving reports, including adult protective services, law enforcement, industry, regulators, and professional licensing boards;

(ii) information regarding what information is being collected by such agencies; and

(iii) information regarding the actions that are taken by such agencies upon receipt of the report and any limits on the agencies' ability to prevent exploitation, such as jurisdictional limits, a lack of expertise, resource challenges, or limiting criteria with regard to the types of victims they are permitted to serve;

(D) an analysis of gaps that may exist in empowering Federal, State, and local agencies to prevent senior exploitation or respond effectively to suspected senior financial exploitation; and

(E) an analysis of the legal hurdles that prevent Federal, State, and local agencies from effectively partnering with each other and private professionals to effectively respond to senior financial exploitation.

(c) SENIOR CITIZEN DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “senior citizen” means an individual over the age of 65.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 1876, the Senior Security Act of 2019, a bipartisan bill introduced by Congressman GOTTHEIMER and Congressman HOLLINGSWORTH.

The financial exploitations of senior citizens is a major problem today, and with the aging of the baby boomer generation, it will only get worse in the coming years.

By 2030, one in five persons in the U.S. is projected to be 65 or older. That would equal approximately 75 million people who are senior citizens.

It is also estimated that nearly one in five Americans over the age of 65 have been a victim of financial exploitation. This can take many forms, including being steered towards inappropriate investment, paying unreasonably high fees for financial services, or outright fraud.

Senior citizens are often targeted because they are more likely to suffer from problems of memory and judgment, making them vulnerable to fraud. Exacerbating the issue is that the overwhelming majority of incidents of elder financial exploitation go unreported to authorities.

The Senior Security Act would help combat elder financial abuse by creating a task force in the SEC to identify the challenges that senior investors encounter and areas in which senior investors would benefit from changes to SEC regulations.

The bill also requires that the GAO conduct a study on the financial exploitation of senior citizens. The GAO study would give us an important comprehensive look at this issue, including a breakdown of the economic costs of financial exploitation of senior citizens, answers to how often this happens, why such abuses often go unreported, and factors that contribute to an increased risk of exploitation.

Americans work hard over their lifetime in order to save for retirement and be financially safe and secure when they get older. Unscrupulous people and companies would take advantage of these senior citizens and rob them of

their hard-earned money. Those people and companies should not be able to get away with such egregious behavior.

This bill would allow us to more effectively combat this growing problem. For that reason, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH) for bringing this bipartisan initiative forward. I urge all Members to vote “yes.”

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support, as well, of H.R. 1876, the Senior Security Act, and I want to thank my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), for their collaboration and work on this important bipartisan legislation, all focused on protecting our seniors.

Madam Speaker, America’s capital markets are open. They are innovative, and they are essential for our families. That is how we live the American Dream. We can grow a nest egg that helps us for our retirement, helps put our kids or grandkids through college, or helps buy a home.

But as Americans age, they become more critical to the success of those open, transparent, and vibrant capital markets because those Americans over 50, Madam Speaker, roughly, have 77 percent of the financial assets in our country.

So when bad actors violate our laws and regulations, commit fraud, or exploit our senior Americans or their families, the integrity of those transparent and open markets and the opportunity of that American Dream are threatened.

To that end, protecting senior investors and preventing such behavior within our financial system is a shared goal. H.R. 1876 protects senior investors and will help the SEC reduce increasing instances of financial exploitation. It will create an interdivisional task force at the SEC to examine and identify challenges facing senior investors.

I have to say, Madam Speaker, over two decades of working in the investment world and working with the SEC and working with FINRA, the regulatory body for broker-dealers and investment advisers, their efforts of sweep exams and the education of the responsibilities of investment advisers are critical.

□ 1245

This will give them more tools to identify what the gaps are today.

I would add, in my career, that gap extends way beyond financial advisers to CPAs, lawyers, people in a position of trust that advise and guide over Americans.

It is shocking for us to report that \$36 billion each year are lost to financial scams in this country and that one

out of five seniors have reported being victims of exploitation.

Many States are taking action on their own. According to the National Conference of State Legislators: “The number of bills introduced by State legislators to combat elder financial exploitation increased by over 57 percent in 3 years.”

So this bipartisan bill is a very important step in generating awareness at the Federal level of the need to strengthen protections for our senior investors.

Madam Speaker, protecting seniors and ensuring the integrity of our capital markets are things that I believe we all stand behind on this House floor. It is our duty to protect our constituents, particularly the most vulnerable, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1876.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), the co-author of this legislation.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on behalf of this bipartisan legislation. I also want to thank my good friend, Congressman TREY HOLLINGSWORTH, for being a great partner on this important legislation.

Since I took office, I have been committed to helping seniors save their hard-earned money for retirement, to helping them cut their taxes and afford their prescription drugs, and to protecting Social Security and Medicare so that, at the end of the day, they can afford to stay in New Jersey and enjoy their lives with their kids and their grandkids.

Unfortunately, there are millions of seniors across the country who have been the victims of financial scams and abuses that have cheated them out of their rightful retirement and are now putting that all at risk. Here are a few disturbing facts.

According to a report from the Senate Special Committee on Aging, older Americans lose approximately \$3 billion each year to financial scams and abuse.

Scammers claim to be a child or a grandchild on the phone. Thousands pose as IRS agents, others as tech support people and representatives; and then, in the end, they are just going after personal data and bank information.

A separate survey from the Investor Protection Trust found that approximately 7 million Americans have reported being victims of exploitation. They scare and intimidate seniors, and many seniors don’t even report it. Only 1 in every 24 cases of elder exploitation actually gets reported.

My mom was even a victim of one of these scammers.

It is appalling. It is offensive. It is unacceptable. Thankfully, we are here today to do something about it.

Today, the House of Representatives is considering our bipartisan legislation, the Senior Security Act, to help

protect vulnerable seniors from predatory scams and financial abuse.

The bipartisan Senior Security Act will help stop financial predators from scamming seniors out of their savings by finding ways to strengthen protections and safeguards for seniors and by creating a senior investor task force at the Securities and Exchange Commission to focus on how seniors are being targeted by fraudsters and to help stop those who seek to take financial advantage of our seniors.

New Jersey's seniors have given us so much. We should always have their backs and help protect them from those who would seek to do them harm and take advantage of them.

Madam Speaker, again, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, for his commitment to protecting seniors, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the work of the sponsor, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and his important personal testimony about his family and the importance of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), the minority sponsor of this bill and my good friend.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Madam Speaker, I, too, rise in support of this legislation.

This is not just a Main Street issue. It is an Elm Street issue; it is a Maple Street issue; it is a Broad Street issue. This is an issue that affects our friends; it affects our neighbors; it affects our veterans; it affects our parents and our grandparents. This is something that has gone on far too long.

We have all seen the startling statistics. Over 24,000 cases were reported to the Treasury Department last year alone, more than double just 5 years ago.

We have seen the statistics about how over \$3 billion a year are lost by our senior citizens to scammers and fraudsters.

We have all seen the statistics showing how more than 10,000 baby boomers are retiring each and every year, so this problem will only grow into the future.

I applaud Representative GOTTHEIMER for reaching across the aisle and working on how we stop this problem, how we slow the growth of this problem by setting up a task force at the SEC to specifically focus on how our senior citizens are being targeted, how we can lessen their vulnerabilities.

This is an issue that I am extremely passionate about, not only because of the statistics that are startling and eye-opening, but also because of the Hoosiers who walk through our offices every single day being the victims of these crimes.

We had one a couple of weeks ago who had already wired half of her life savings as a part of a scheme to get a

Nigerian prince into the country. We had somebody last year who had wired over \$8,000 because they believed that their son had been imprisoned in Mexico, wrongfully, and the money was needed to get him out of prison.

They try all sorts of schemes. They try all sorts of ruses. Well, it is time that we come together and try to stop them.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the work of Representative GOTTHEIMER reaching across the aisle and developing legislation on how we find the best practices to ensure that our senior citizens, our veterans, our friends, our neighbors, our parents, and our grandparents are protected in this very important time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana's comments. He has been an excellent author.

Again, Madam Speaker, you hear the testimony from both sides of the aisle, from constituents in both these districts, and the importance of this.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, we urge adoption of H.R. 1876, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate, again, Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH for having brought this bill to the floor. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important piece of legislation to comprehensively examine and strengthen the protections against financial exploitation of our senior citizens.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1876.

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. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING THE PROTECTION OF ELDERS THROUGH FINANCIAL LITERACY

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 328) supporting the protection of elders through financial literacy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 328

Whereas in the context of the financial exploitation of the elderly, Federal statute defines "exploitation" as "the fraudulent or

otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or fiduciary, that uses the resources of an elder for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain, or that results in depriving an elder of rightful access to, or use of, benefits, resources, belongings, or assets" (42 U.S.C. 1397j(8)) ("Elder Financial Exploitation");

Whereas the National Adult Protective Services Association has stated, "Elder abuse is vastly under-reported; only one in 44 cases of financial abuse is ever reported";

Whereas Elder Financial Exploitation is expected to increase in the upcoming years as 10,000 baby boomers are turning 65 each day;

Whereas estimates by the Investor Protection Trust suggest that as many as one of five citizens over the age of 65 are victims of the theft of money, property, identity or belongings;

Whereas according to the National Center on Aging, "Up to 5 million older Americans are abused every year, and the annual loss by victims of financial abuse is estimated to be at least \$36.5 billion.";

Whereas older adults are targeted for Elder Financial Exploitation through schemes such as fraud by trusted family, caregivers, and fiduciaries, and through scams by strangers often committed by international criminal networks;

Whereas common schemes by fraudsters and scammers include, lottery and sweepstakes scams, telemarketing scams, home-repair scams, computer-repair scams, investment scams, internet phishing scams, abuse of fiduciary authority, and identity theft;

Whereas Financial Literacy Month aims to highlight for all Americans the importance of establishing and maintaining healthy financial habits;

Whereas education about healthy financial habits includes the protection of one's finances from financial exploitation, especially for older adults who are vulnerable to targeted frauds and scams;

Whereas to combat this serious financial concern and to protect the elder community, this education must also extend to financial institutions, law enforcement, and regulatory agencies so they may work together to understand and detect these frauds and scams;

Whereas these partnerships include not only Federal agencies, but also State, local, and Tribal authorities such as law enforcement and adult protective services agencies;

Whereas the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) is vital to the pursuit of these bad actors, collecting suspicious activity report (SAR) information and sharing, as necessary, its data, analysis, and guidance with appropriate public- and private-sector partners focused on detecting and ending Elder Financial Exploitation;

Whereas FinCEN, working with Federal consumer and law enforcement partners engages with financial institutions and State and local authorities to educate on the signs of Elder Financial Exploitation;

Whereas FinCEN, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and the Department of Justice issued in 2017 a joint memorandum to provide information on the use of SARs in the investigation of Elder Financial Exploitation, building on a 2011 Advisory that identified red flags for detection; and

Whereas despite the broad efforts by law enforcement, regulatory agencies, financial institutions, and private sector organizations to educate and share information, Elder Financial Exploitation persists as a multi-billion dollar industry, more can be done: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Financial Literacy Month to raise public awareness about—

(A) the importance of personal financial education in the United States; and

(B) the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances;

(2) acknowledges that raising awareness of threats to personal finances, especially for vulnerable, targeted populations like older adults and their relatives and caregivers, is only one party of financial literacy;

(3) understands that to combat Elder Financial Exploitation, it is also necessary to encourage continued education and collaboration among law enforcement, financial institutions, regulatory agencies, and private sector organizations allowing detection, prevention, reporting, and investigation of these crimes;

(4) supports work being done by FinCEN and its partners to educate the stakeholders which serve and protect America's elder community;

(5) urges continued public-private partnership and appropriate information sharing to prevent, detect, report, and investigate Elder Financial Exploitation; and

(6) urges action to assist with remediation and reporting, as well as prevention and detection to have best possible data, feedback, and incident response.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support H. Res. 328, a resolution introduced by Congressman CASTEN of Illinois and Congressman ROSE of Tennessee.

This bipartisan resolution acknowledges an important component of financial literacy, and it is raising awareness of threats to personal finances, especially for vulnerable targeted populations such as older adults. It also encourages continued public-private partnerships and information sharing to effectively prevent, detect, report, and investigate elder financial exploitation.

As we have heard, the baby boomer generation is getting older; 10,000 of them are turning 65 each day. According to the National Center on Aging, up to 5 million older Americans are abused every year, and the annual loss by victims of financial abuse is estimated to be at least \$36.5 billion. That is why we need to be proactive about combating this serious problem on multiple fronts.

We should work to arm our senior citizens with the knowledge they need

to effectively detect and prevent financial exploitation by would-be criminals. Understanding the red flags and warning signs to look for is important first step.

In addition, we should continue to support efforts by FinCEN and other regulatory and law enforcement agencies to ensure that information at the disposal of these agencies is used to better deter and respond to incidents of elder financial exploitation.

Efforts like H. Res. 328, together with the Senior Security Act of 2019 and the Senior Safe Act of 2018, show Congress' commitment to supporting our Nation's senior citizens on a bipartisan basis. It also shows our commitment to encouraging collaboration, public-private partnerships, and information sharing in order to effectively combat financial exploitation of senior citizens.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN W. ROSE) for bringing this bipartisan initiative forward, and I urge all Members to vote "yes."

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 328, Supporting the Protection of Elders Through Financial Literacy. This collaboration by Mr. CASTEN of Illinois and Mr. ROSE of Tennessee is, again, an important bipartisan effort to focus on financial literacy during Financial Literacy Month as well as to call attention to the challenges that we have in making sure that our senior Americans are taken care of and their financial well-being.

According to research conducted by the AARP Public Policy Institute, one in five older Americans is a victim of financial exploitation each year. These victims lose up to \$3 billion annually, or more than \$120,000 per victim, which is more than most Americans have in their entire retirement savings.

Sadly, only 1 in 44 cases is reported. That is the challenge that we have talked about here this afternoon, that we make sure that that reporting is identified so that restitution can be made.

I am proud of the work the Congress did on the Senior Safe Act, legislation that originated in the Financial Services Committee and was ultimately signed into law last year. That legislation took an important step in offering greater financial protection to seniors by encouraging financial institutions, investment advisers, and brokers to report suspected fraud or elder abuse to law enforcement—a good step.

This resolution we are now discussing also complements the fine work of Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH for their work on the Senior Security Act.

Prevention is the best solution. More can and should be done to educate sen-

iors and all Americans on healthy financial habits and protection against financial exploitation.

The unfortunate reality is that seniors can be especially vulnerable to financial fraud, as outlined by Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Even according to the SEC's own report in 2018, "Elder Financial Exploitation," it is attributed to cognitive decline and wealth held by older generations.

We must work together to ensure that bad actors don't take advantage of this population. These crimes range from complex scams to the all-too-common case of someone close to an elderly person tricking them into signing away money that they had saved for retirement. It is this last type of exploitation that is especially troubling.

□ 1300

As I referenced a few minutes ago, people in a position of trust: lawyers, CPAs, financial advisers.

H. Res. 328 highlights the importance of educating the elderly about healthy financial habits that include protecting one's finances from financial exploitation. You can't take it for granted that we know better than to finance a child's entrapment in Mexico or that you are going to help a Nigerian prince. It sounds farfetched. But it happens every single day across this country, and education is the best form of prevention.

I think we can all agree that the status quo is not enough. H. Res. 328 raises much-needed public awareness for the importance of personal financial education for the elderly and highlights the collaboration between banks, law enforcement, and financial advisers to protect older generations.

For those reasons, I congratulate and thank my friends, Representatives CASTEN and ROSE, for their good work.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JOHN W. ROSE), the Republican author of this measure.

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 328.

I applaud my colleague, Mr. CASTEN, for his thoughtful leadership on this initiative.

For too long, the financial exploitation of our seniors has been swept under the rug. It is truly heartbreaking to hear stories of Tennesseans' parents, siblings, and friends being taken advantage of, often by those they trust the most. It is time to equip our friends, families, and neighbors with the knowledge and tools they need to guard against the heartbreak of their hard-earned security and stability being stolen in the golden years of life.

Age brings many of life's most difficult challenges, but financial exploitation should not be one of them. It is incumbent upon us to correct this injustice and encourage the many community partnerships which work to do the same, including the work of our

men and women in law enforcement, various nonprofit organizations, and affiliated regulatory agencies.

Scammers and deceivers hurt good folks across the Sixth District of Tennessee and across America.

My esteemed colleague from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) and I urge our fellow Members to join us in standing against this despicable injustice plaguing our country.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), the co-author of this legislation.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 328.

I thank Representative ROSE for working on this resolution with me in a bipartisan manner, as well as Chair WATERS and her staff for their commitment to seniors and financial literacy.

H. Res. 328 supports the security of seniors through the promotion of financial literacy. This resolution supports the critical public-private partnerships that enable collaboration among law enforcement, financial institutions, and regulatory agencies to expand financial literacy and to detect fraud and scams against seniors.

America's seniors have worked hard to raise families, pay their taxes, protect our country, and build our communities. They have scraped and saved to ensure their financial futures.

Ten thousand baby boomers are turning 65 every day and, by 2030, the number of Americans aged 65 and older will more than double to 71 million, or about 20 percent of the United States population.

These older Americans, who have given so much, are increasingly being targeted for financial exploitation. And in this digital age, with personal information so easily procured, the scams are only getting more complex and harder to detect. We cannot stand by and let our parents and grandparents continue to be ripped off by increasingly savvy con artists.

What would this resolution do?

It would support the goals of Financial Literacy Month to raise public awareness about the importance of personal financial education in the United States;

It would acknowledge that raising awareness of threats to personal finances, especially for populations like older adults and their relatives and caregivers, is only one part of financial literacy;

It would recognize that to combat elder financial exploitation, it is also necessary to encourage continued collaboration among law enforcement, financial institutions, regulatory agencies, and private sector organizations to allow the detection, prevention, reporting, and investigation of those crimes;

It would support work being done by FinCEN, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and its partners to educate the stakeholders that serve and protect America's elder community;

It would urge continued public-private partnership and appropriate information sharing to prevent, detect, report, and investigate elder financial exploitation; and

Finally, it would urge action to assist with remediation and reporting, as well as prevention and detection to have the best possible data, feedback, and incident response.

The path to economic security begins with basic money management. But in an increasingly complex financial landscape, we cannot limit our focus on financial literacy only at the level of individuals and caregivers. We must also include financial institutions, law enforcement, and regulatory agencies so that they can work together to understand and detect these frauds and scams.

Financial exploitation can be devastating. Studies have shown that seniors who suffer from abuse, neglect, or exploitation are three times more likely to die than their counterparts.

Adding to this devastation—and this is painful, but we have to admit it—is the exploitation is often committed by family members, by trusted friends, or by caregivers. Financial abuse often occurs with the implied acknowledgement and/or consent of the elder person and therefore can be much more difficult to detect or to prove.

Employees within the financial services industry may often be the first to detect those changes in the behaviors of customers with whom they have regular contact. That frontline relationship places institutions in a unique position to assist to protect customers, upholding the inherent trust relationship with their clients.

In acknowledging this role, FinCEN issued an advisory to financial institutions on filing suspicious activity reports regarding elder financial exploitation that would provide red flag indicators and instructions on how to report elder financial exploitation through suspicious activity reports.

Timely reporting of suspicious elder financial exploitation activity is critical to engaging entities that may have complementary information on the victim or the perpetrator and may be well positioned to collaborate or investigate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 328, supporting efforts to combat elder financial exploitation.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, this has been a good afternoon on a bipartisan basis to talk about the importance of financial literacy. It is something we all try to practice what we preach. We try to encourage a broad sense of partnership between the regulators, our financial services firms, the AARP, our schools, and other people to enhance financial literacy from adolescence to elder years. And I think about what we have heard today on what we are try-

ing to protect our constituents from through education: internet scams, Nigerian princes' schemes, violators from a trusted person.

And then I thought back, just sitting here, Madam Speaker, of my own in-laws, now deceased about 7 years—one with Alzheimer's and one just old-age infirmities—and cleaning up all the sweepstakes applications that they had received and sent money to in those final years of their life.

I thank my friends, led by Dr. FOSTER and others. I congratulate Representative CASTEN and Representative ROSE on this particular measure, H. Res. 328. I urge all of my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to again congratulate Mr. CASTEN and Mr. ROSE for having brought this resolution to the floor. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this important resolution to empower senior citizens and promote public-private partnerships in order to strengthen our enforcement against crimes of financial exploitation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 328.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 304. Raising a question of the privileges of the House.

Whereas Michael Cohen testified under oath as a witness before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform on February 27, 2019;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath, "I have never asked for, nor would I accept, a pardon from President Trump";

Whereas in truth and fact, attorney for Michael Cohen, Lanny Davis, admitted on March 6, 2019, that Cohen "directed his attorney to explore possibilities of a pardon at one point with Donald J. Trump lawyer Rudy Giuliani as well as other lawyers advising President Trump";

Whereas in truth and fact, attorney for Michael Cohen, Michael Monico, admitted in a March 12, 2019, letter that Cohen's testimony was inaccurate;

Whereas in truth and fact, the ex post representation by Cohen's attorney does not annul Cohen's intentionally false and misleading testimony;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen's testimony under oath was delivered in the context of apologizing for all his criminal activities;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen's denial of ever seeking a pardon contained no qualifiers about the context of his statement;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen's denial of ever seeking a pardon, as uttered under oath in his testimony, was absolute and unequivocal;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen testified under oath that he and his lawyers spent hours editing his written statement submitted to the Committee on Oversight and Reform preceding his testimony, which included the written assertion, "I have never asked for, nor would I accept, a pardon from President Trump";

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen's denial in his written statement of never asking for a Presidential pardon was an unqualified assertion;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath that he "did not want to go to the White House" and he "did not want a role or title in the administration";

Whereas in truth and fact the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York submitted to Federal court a sentencing memorandum expressing Michael Cohen's desire to work in the White House, explaining: "during and after the campaign, Cohen privately told friends and colleagues, including in seized text messages, that he expected to be given a prominent role and title in the new administration. When that did not materialize, Cohen found a way to monetize his relationship with and access to the President";

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath on other factual matters of material significance;

Whereas Michael Cohen's intentionally false testimony was aimed at obscuring the truth and ameliorating the extent of his own personal embarrassment;

Whereas intentionally false testimony to a committee of the House of Representatives harms the integrity of the proceedings of the House;

Whereas it is a Federal crime to provide false information to Congress and the failure to enforce this crime further undermines the integrity of the House; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the House of Representatives that providing a copy of the official transcript of the hearing of the Committee on Oversight and Reform on February 27, 2019, to the Department of Justice would aid the Attorney General's con-

sideration of investigation and potential prosecution of Michael Cohen's criminal conduct: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, that the House of Representatives directs the chair of the Oversight and Reform Committee to submit to the Attorney General an official copy of the transcript of the hearing during which Michael Cohen testified under oath on February 27, 2019.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Tennessee will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not, at this point, determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

CAPTAIN ROBERT L. MARTIN POST OFFICE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1449) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, as the "Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1449

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

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN ROBERT L. MARTIN POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1449, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, as the Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office.

Captain Robert L. Martin was a true American hero dedicated to serving his country to ensure the continued safety of all Americans.

Robert L. Martin graduated from Iowa State University, where he completed a civilian pilot training program, and joined the Army Air Corps in January 1944. Captain Martin was one of the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II, serving as a combat pilot in the 100th Fighter Squadron of the 332nd Fighter Group.

During his 64th mission, he was shot down over German-occupied territory and safely evaded capture for 5 weeks to return across Allied lines. He left the Army in 1945 with the rank of captain.

His war decorations include the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 6 oak leaf clusters, and the Purple Heart. Martin was also awarded the Congressional Medal in 2007 by President George W. Bush at a ceremony honoring the Tuskegee Airmen.

Having lived in Olympia Fields, Illinois, it would be a tribute to his life's accomplishments to name the post office there as the Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office, bringing a source of pride to the community in honoring a great American hero.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to support H.R. 1449, sponsored by Representative KELLY. H.R. 1449 names a post office in Olympia Fields, Illinois, in honor of Captain Robert L. Martin.

During World War II, Martin joined the Army Air Force and trained at the airfield in Tuskegee, Alabama.

As a member of the famous Tuskegee Airmen, Captain Martin flew over 63 missions. He was attached to the 100th Fighter Squadron, providing air support for Allied bombing runs into Central Europe.

Captain Martin was decorated with a Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with oak leaf clusters, and the Purple Heart. In 2007, President Bush awarded Captain Martin the Congressional Medal of Honor for his bravery in World War II.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1449.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENDERSON VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1198) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, as the "Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1198

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

SECTION 1. HENDERSON VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, shall be known and designated as the "Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 1198, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, as the Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building.

Every day, Americans across this great country rely on more than 2 million brave men and women who have committed their lives to ensuring the comfort and safety of the rest of us by serving in the United States military.

Today, there are more than 18 million veterans who have served in the

armed services. These brave Americans protect the very foundation of this great country. Naming a post office to honor the veterans who have served and sacrificed for us is but a small part of what these brave men and women deserve from the country to whom they have given so much.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1198, which names a post office in Henderson, Nevada, in honor of the city's veterans.

The men and women from Henderson, Nevada—and all veterans—who fought to protect this Nation should be honored. They leave their homes and their families to defend our freedom. Veterans put their lives on the line for the liberties we enjoy. Today, we celebrate and honor the veterans from Henderson, Nevada.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1198.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSMAN BILL CARNEY POST OFFICE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 828) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the "Congressman Bill Carney Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 828

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSMAN BILL CARNEY POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Congressman Bill Carney Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Congressman Bill Carney Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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 this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 828, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the Congressman Bill Carney Post Office.

Representative Bill Carney was a man truly committed to public service. Before serving as a distinguished Member of this body, Bill not only served the people of Suffolk in their legislature, but also the United States of America as a member of the Army Medical Corps.

Bill Carney was born in Brooklyn, New York, and went on to serve the United States Army Medical Corps after graduating from high school.

After leaving the military, Bill began serving in the Suffolk County legislature before being elected to serve the people of New York's First Congressional District in 1978.

Representative Carney is remembered not only for his contributions to this body, but also for the lighthearted personality, humor, and humility that he brought with him each day he served.

Sadly, Bill Carney died in May of 2017, and he is sorely missed. Naming a post office in Bill's honor in Suffolk County is the least we should do to honor the great career and life of Bill Carney.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 828, introduced by the gentleman from New York's First District, Congressman LEE ZELDIN.

H.R. 828 names a postal facility in Smithtown, New York, in honor of the man who represented the First District of New York four decades ago, former Congressman Bill Carney.

Congressman Carney was elected in 1978 to represent Long Island. He served as a Member of this body for four terms, until 1987.

Before coming to Congress, Mr. Carney served in the United States Army Medical Corps. From there, he went on to serve his local government as a member of the Suffolk County legislature. Congressman Carney is remembered as a lighthearted man of the people.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

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

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my friend.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 828, my legislation to honor the life and legacy of former Congressman William Carney by renaming the post office in Smithtown, New York, in his honor.

Congressman Carney was a beloved husband, father, and grandfather, but for our community, for New York's First Congressional District, for our Nation, and for the ideals in which he believed, he was a fighter until the very end.

Even before his life in politics, his commitment to serving his country and community never wavered. After attending Florida State University, Congressman Carney joined the United States Army Medical Corps, where he served from 1961 to 1964.

After leaving the Army and working in the private sector, Congressman Carney was elected to the Suffolk County legislature for 3 years before being elected to the United States House of Representatives to represent the First Congressional District of New York from 1979 to 1987.

He was the first registered Conservative Party member to ever be elected to Congress. He was a relentless fighter for his constituents and the ideals in which he believed, and he had a long list of accomplishments to show for it.

Legislation he introduced and ushered into law designated areas of the Fire Island Seashore as wilderness, ensuring its conservation and protection for generations to come. To this day, Fire Island remains one of Long Island's most iconic landmarks thanks, in part, to his legislation.

Always so very proud of America's servicemembers and having served in the Army himself, Representative Carney was a proud cosponsor of the Korean War Memorial Act, as well as the resolution to recognize the vital role played by members of the National Guard and Reserves in the defense of our Nation.

Mr. Carney will be remembered for his strength, integrity, and commitment to his district and Nation. There is no place he loved more than Long Island, no people he more admired, and there is no doubt there is no place he would rather have his legacy enshrined than in the community that he called home.

Nearly 2 years ago, Congressman Carney lost his final battle. He was suffering from prostate cancer.

He is survived by his wife and childhood sweetheart, Barbara Haverlin; his two daughters, Jackie and Julie; and his four grandchildren. Thank you to each and every one of them for allowing their husband, father, and grandfather to dedicate his life to serving our community.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 828, as well as the other two postal-naming bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 828.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and:

- Pass H.R. 1876; and
Agree to H. Res. 328.

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

NATIONAL SENIOR INVESTOR INITIATIVE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1876) to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 20, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—392

- Adams, Bilirakis, Byrne
Aderholt, Bishop (GA), Calvert
Aguilar, Bishop (UT), Carbajal
Allen, Blumenauer, Cárdenas
Allred, Blunt Rochester, Carson (IN)
Amodei, Bonamici, Carter (GA)
Arrington, Bost, Carter (TX)
Axne, Boyle, Brendan, Case
Babin, F., Casten (IL)
Bacon, Brady, Castor (FL)
Baird, Brindisi, Castro (TX)
Balderson, Brooks (IN), Chabot
Banks, Brown (MD), Cheney
Barr, Brownley (CA), Chu, Judy
Barragán, Buchanan, Cicilline
Bass, Bucshon, Cisneros
Beatty, Budd, Clark (MA)
Bera, Burgess, Clarke (NY)
Bergman, Bustos, Clay
Beyer, Butterfield, Cleaver

- Cline, Himes, Murphy
Cloud, Holding, Nadler
Clyburn, Hollingsworth, Napolitano
Cohen, Horn, Kendra S., Neal
Cole, Horsford, Neguse
Collins (GA), Houlihan, Newhouse
Collins (NY), Hoyer, Norcross
Comer, Hudson, Nunes
Conaway, Huffman, O'Halleran
Connolly, Huizenga, Ocasio-Cortez
Cook, Hunter, Olson
Cooper, Hurd (TX), Palazzo
Correa, Jackson Lee, Pallone
Costa, Jayapal, Palmer
Courtney, Jeffries, Panetta
Cox (CA), Johnson (GA), Pappas
Craig, Johnson (LA), Pascrell
Crawford, Johnson (OH), Payne
Crenshaw, Johnson (SD), Pence
Crist, Johnson (TX), Perlmutter
Crow, Jordan, Perry
Cuellar, Joyce (OH), Peters
Cummings, Joyce (PA), Peterson
Cunningham, Kaptur, Phillips
Curtis, Katko, Pingree
Davids (KS), Keating, Pocan
Davidson (OH), Kelly (IL), Porter
Davis (CA), Kelly (MS), Posey
Davis, Danny K., Kelly (PA), Price (NC)
Davis, Rodney, Kennedy, Quigley
Dean, Khanna, Raskin
DeFazio, Kildee, Reed
DeGette, Kilmer, Reschenthaler
DeLauro, Kim, Rice (NY)
DelBene, Kind, Rice (SC)
Delgado, King (IA), Richmond
Demings, King (NY), Riggleman
DeSaulnier, Kinzinger, Roby
DesJarlais, Kirkpatrick, Rodgers (WA)
Diaz-Balart, Krishnamoorthi, Roe, David P.
Dingell, Kuster (NH), Rogers (AL)
Doggett, Kustoff (TN), Rogers (KY)
Doyle, Michael, LaHood, Rose (NY)
F., LaMalfa, Rose, John W.
Duffy, Lamb, Rouda
Duncan, Lamborn, Rouzer
Dunn, Langevin, Roybal-Allard
Emmer, Larsen (WA), Ruiz
Escobar, Larson (CT), Ruppersberger
Eshoo, Latta, Rush
Español, Lawrence, Rutherford
Estes, Lawson (FL), Sánchez
Evans, Lee (CA), Sarbanes
Ferguson, Lee (NV), Scalise
Finkenauer, Lesko, Scanlon
Fitzpatrick, Levin (CA), Schanowsky
Fleischmann, Levin (MI), Schiff
Fletcher, Lewis, Schneider
Flores, Lieu, Ted, Schrader
Foster, Lipinski, Schriener
Foxy (NC), Loebsock, Schweikert
Frankel, Lofgren, Scott (VA)
Fudge, Long, Scott, Austin
Fulcher, Loudermilk, Scott, David
Gabbard, Lowenthal, Sensenbrenner
Gallagher, Lowey, Serrano
Gallego, Lucas, Sewell (AL)
Garamendi, Luetkemeyer, Shalala
Garcia (IL), Luján, Sherman
Garcia (TX), Luria, Sherrill
Gianforte, Lynch, Shimkus
Gibbs, Malinowski, Slotkin
Golden, Maloney, Smith (MO)
Gomez, Carolyn B., Smith (NE)
Gonzalez (OH), Maloney, Sean, Smith (NJ)
Gonzalez (TX), Marchant, Smith (WA)
Gooden, Marshall, Smucker
Gottheimer, Mast, Soto
Granger, Matsui, Spanberger
Graves (GA), McAdams, Spano
Graves (LA), McBath, Speier
Graves (MO), McCarthy, Stanton
Green (TX), McCaul, Stauber
Grijalva, McCollum, Stefanik
Grothman, McEachin, Steil
Guest, McGovern, Stevens
Guthrie, McHenry, Stewart
Haaland, McKinley, Stivers
Hagedorn, McNeerney, Suozzi
Harder (CA), Meadows, Swalwell (CA)
Hartzler, Meng, Takano
Hayes, Meuser, Taylor
Heck, Miller, Thompson (CA)
Herrera Beutler, Mitchell, Thompson (MS)
Hice (GA), Moolenaar, Thompson (PA)
Higgins (LA), Mooney (WV), Thornberry
Higgins (NY), Morelle, Timmons
Hill (AR), Mucarsel-Powell, Tipton
Hill (CA), Mullin, Tonko

Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman

Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—20

Amash
Armstrong
Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burchett
Gaetz

Gohmert
Gosar
Green (TN)
Griffith
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Massie

McClintock
Norman
Ratcliffe
Roy
Steube
Walker

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham
Cartwright
Deutch
Engel
Fortenberry
Hastings
Meeks

Moore
Moulton
Omar
Pressley
Rooney (FL)
Ryan
Simpson

Sires
Titus
Tlaib
Torres (CA)
Yoho

□ 1359

Messrs. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, GAETZ, and NORMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CLINE, MAST, and DAVIDSON of Ohio changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I regret that a logistical conflict prevented me from making the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 170.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 170.

SUPPORTING THE PROTECTION OF ELDERS THROUGH FINANCIAL LITERACY

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. 328) supporting the protection of elders through financial literacy, 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 Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 6, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—411

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar

Allen
Allred
Amodei

Armstrong
Arrington
Axne

Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.

Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Fox (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed

Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed

Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schriener
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman

Sherrill
Shimkus
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Stell
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner

Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walker
Walorski
Walden
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman

NAYS—6

Amash
Biggs

Gosar
Massie

McClintock
Roy

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham
Cartwright
Deutch
Fortenberry
Hastings

Meeks
Moulton
Rooney (FL)
Ryan
Simpson

Sires
Titus
Torres (CA)
Yoho

□ 1409

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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, April 30, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 30, 2019, at 11:13 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable Richard G. Lugar, former United States Senator for the State of Indiana S. Res. 173.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HAGEDORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, legislation to block fourth-trimester abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. HAGEDORN. Madam Speaker, for the protection of life, I urge that the Speaker immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

ACT TO PROTECT THE UIGHUR COMMUNITY

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for constituents with whom I recently met whose family is one among millions of Uighurs, the ethnic Muslim community from Xinjiang in northwest China being persecuted by the Chinese Government.

My constituents' parents are among the estimated 1 million Uighurs and other Muslims who are currently being held in camps because of their faith and ethnicity. The reports of what is happening to this community—mass targeting, detention, and torture based on faith and origin—echo the darkest chapters in human history.

I am heartened to see that there is bipartisan support for doing something about it. That is why I say to leadership: Move the bipartisan UIGHUR Act and the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act through committee and to the floor so that we can pass these bills in the House, push the Senate to take them up, and get them signed into law.

Only by acting in moments like this can we truly live up to the pledge "never again." Let's stand together and say no to ethnic cleansing on our watch.

□ 1415

TITLE X GAG RULE PUTS LIVES AT RISK

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Trump administration's Title X gag rule. The gag rule is a Federal prohibition on

funding for healthcare providers who may refer patients to an abortion.

The Title X gag rule will endanger patients who rely on health clinics that will lose Federal funding. That means women will have less access to cancer screening, reproductive health services, birth control, and health education.

By prohibiting medical caregivers from making decisions in the best interest of patients, the gag rule puts lives at risk. All patients, regardless of geography, income, race, or identity, should be able to access whatever medical care and health information their healthcare provider thinks is relevant.

The Trump administration should not be deciding what a doctor or a nurse or any healthcare giver tells their patients.

UNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we have gone through some very difficult times, and I want to call the roll: Tree of Life, Robert Gregory Bowers; Mother Emanuel Church, Dylann Roof; Christchurch, Brenton Harrison Tarrant; just recently, in San Diego, John Earnest; and recently arrested, Mark Steven Domingo.

First of all, I want to thank the FBI and its investigation for stopping Mark Steven Domingo.

I challenge all of us, as colleagues, to begin the debate and discussion on hate, White nationalism, and Nazism, for it is not something that we can allow to seed and grow. We can't allow someone who wants to attack a White nationalist group that is meeting because of hatred, nor can we allow someone to gun people down in their synagogues or mosques or churches.

America is better than this, and we as Members of Congress need to begin to discuss race, discrimination, Nazism, White nationalism, sexism. We need to discuss it in a way that is even more than legislation.

So I call upon the Nation, I call upon this President to stand up and announce to America that enough is enough and that he stands for the unity of all of us.

ADDRESSING HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN VENEZUELA

(Mrs. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, there is a humanitarian crisis in Venezuela and it is man-made.

My view is simple. The people of Venezuela will not prosper as long as the Maduro regime remains in power. It has proven itself to be cruel, incompetent, and antidemocratic.

Ideally, the regime will go peacefully, but it must go.

The United States cannot be passive. We must stand behind the proud Ven-

ezuelan patriots who have taken to the streets and are struggling to reclaim their country from the regime that is destroying it. We must be ready to support these brave men and women with all elements of American power, always working alongside our partners in Latin America.

The Venezuelan people need to know that we have their backs. If the Maduro regime targets its own citizens with violence, it should be prepared to suffer the consequences.

To the Maduro regime, I say "enough," "basta." To the people of Venezuela, I say "be strong," "fuerza"; "we are with you," "estamos con ustedes."

SUPPORTING EFFORTS OF NOAA CORPS

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, today, with my colleagues Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUFFMAN of California, I am proud to introduce the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Amendments Act of 2019.

The women and men of the NOAA Corps proudly and professionally operate NOAA's highly specialized fleet of research and survey ships and aircraft, including the famed Hurricane Hunter aviators. Several of those ships are based in my State of Hawaii and conduct surveys used to manage our fisheries and protected species and study and map the ocean floor.

Like the other uniformed services, the NOAA Corps officers spend most of their careers away from home at sea, in the air, and in remote locations such as Antarctica conducting this important work but are often overlooked in the legislative and administrative process, resulting in a patchwork of statutory authorities, benefits, and obligations of service.

Our bill will help the NOAA Corps improve recruitment, retention, and diversity to attract the best and the brightest commissioned officers and better align this great Corps with the other uniformed services as they continue their great service to NOAA and to our Nation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill and support the efforts of the NOAA Corps.

PARIS AGREEMENT IS FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cox of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. 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 the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lead a Western Caucus Special Order to voice our vehement opposition to H.R. 9, which aims to prevent President Trump from withdrawing from the fundamentally flawed Paris Agreement.

In 2015, more than 170 countries signed a nonbinding agreement at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Paris. While most countries set a target reduction of carbon emissions below its 2005 level, the Obama administration sought to dramatically reduce the United States' carbon emissions by between 26 and 28 percent below its 2005 level by 2025.

Before I proceed any further, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS). He is a tireless advocate for small businesses in his district, many of whom have been harmed by this type of legislation.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOSAR, and I appreciate his leading the Western Caucus Special Order hour of the day and all that he does, and the members of the Western Caucus, on these issues.

President Obama attempted to implement the Paris Agreement domestically through an executive order he issued in September 2016, but the Paris Agreement was never ratified by the United States Senate as is constitutionally required for a treaty to exist and, therefore, is not a legally binding treaty.

In June 2017, President Trump announced that the U.S. would cease all participation in the 2015 Paris Agreement, which is fully in its power to decide because, again, U.S. involvement is not legally binding. I applauded that decision then; I continue to applaud it now, and this is one of the reasons why.

This Paris accord has little efficacy. It will not save the world. Even if we take at face value the assumption that climate change poses an existential threat to the planet, U.S. compliance with the Paris Agreement, or even a full embrace of a far more expansive Green New Deal, would do little to avert that result.

The U.S. is no longer the primary source of global CO₂ emissions. In fact, between 2005 and 2017, our Nation has reduced CO₂ emissions by 862 million tons, and market forces are increasingly pushing us toward using cleaner and more efficient fuels.

Meanwhile, during roughly the same period, China increased its emissions by 4 billion tons and India by 1.3 billion tons. It is extremely unlikely that either China or India are going to fulfill their requirements within the Paris Agreement.

But even if they and every other country in the world, including the

U.S., were to comply, we would still only succeed in reducing global temperatures by less than one-half of 1 degree Celsius by the year 2100. That is according to the National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Like the Green New Deal, H.R. 9 is nothing more than cynical partisan messaging. I urge everyone in this Chamber to vote "no."

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BIGGS for his comments.

H.R. 9 seeks to mandate implementations of those same technically implausible and unrealistic emissions goals in order to appease extremists. The bill also seeks to prevent Federal funds from being used to withdraw from the flawed Paris Agreement.

Americans for Tax Reform estimates the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 6.5 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our gross domestic product by over \$2.5 trillion.

NERA Consulting estimates those numbers are even higher and that the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 31.6 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our GDP by over \$3 trillion.

In June of 2017, President Trump announced he will withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, stating: "The Paris climate accord is simply the latest example of Washington entering into an agreement that disadvantages the United States to the exclusive benefit of other countries, leaving the American workers and taxpayers to absorb the costs in terms of lost jobs, lower wages, shuttering factories, and vastly diminishing economic production."

There are other significant flaws of the Paris Agreement. MIT found the Paris Agreement will only result in a global temperature reduction of 0.2 degrees Celsius by 2100. Under the Paris climate agreement, China and India will actually increase emissions until at least 2030.

The Climate Action Tracker, a group of European research organizations, found that participating parties will not meet their commitments, and those are the goals of the Paris Agreement.

The European Climate Action Network reported that no single country in Europe is performing sufficiently to meet Paris Agreement goals, and those that have been making the most progress on their promises did not make large commitments in the first place.

A recent United Nations Emissions Gap report found all participating countries will have to at least triple their efforts in order to meet the Paris Agreement's basic goals.

Given how unrealistic and illogical the Paris Agreement is, the U.S. should not inflict monumental harm on our economy chasing a white unicorn.

Fortunately, there is an alternative. Members of the Western Caucus support personal responsibility, less government intervention in our daily

lives, and freedom. They defend property rights and believe that private ownership of property is a fundamental right in America. Our vision encourages innovation and less burdensome mandates.

Members of the caucus support local control and believe that stewardship of our environment and natural resources is best accomplished by empowering local stakeholders, not victimizing them.

The people who depend on the land to provide security for their families and communities understand these resources best. States and municipalities are best suited to deal with local issues than the distant, out-of-touch Washington bureaucrats.

The caucus seeks to promote access to our Nation's energy and resource potential while pursuing a truly all-of-the-above energy approach that aims to ensure the U.S. is a global energy leader.

Our vision utilizes the current energy renaissance and the American energy dominant policies currently being implemented by the Trump administration. America's energy renaissance is the backbone of our economy; it is a story of freedom, prosperity, and opportunity.

After decades of reliance on other countries to meet our energy needs, the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that America will export more energy than it imports starting in 2020. We are no longer dependent on volatile foreign sources produced in Russia and Saudi Arabia.

Recent innovations and technology improvements associated with hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have allowed shale resources previously deemed uneconomical to be developed and the main reason the U.S. was the world's leader in carbon emissions reductions in 2015, 2016, and 2017.

That is right. Fracking, demonized by environmental extremists without justification, has proven to be the best energy solution for our environment.

Abundant oil and natural gas have reduced electricity bills, kept gas prices low, and provided the largest share of U.S. electric power generation in recent years.

The United States is the world's top energy producer, and the American Dream is thriving. Passing H.R. 9 and staying in the Paris Agreement threatens that dream.

This is not a partisan issue. This is about doing what is right for America and about protecting freedom and opportunity for our children and grandchildren. I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to reject H.R. 9.

Now, with that, I yield to my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). As the Republican leader on the Natural Resources Committee and previously as its chairman, he has been one of the biggest leaders in promoting American energy dominance.

□ 1430

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOSAR for yielding me time. I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, look, I was listening to a lecture the other day about the old Romans, the Roman Empire. The Romans' success in creating their empire was that they were incredibly creative and adaptive. They saw situations that needed to be changed, something new, and they did it.

They had perfected the phalanx approach. They learned from the Greeks how to fight. Yet when they came against the Samnites who were living in the hills, that phalanx approach was totally useless. So what the Romans did is created a way around that, another source, to have a very flexible, highly mobile type of attack force, which they called the Legions. They simply became adaptive to the new situation.

This is where I wish the other side of this body would try to become less dogmatic and more adaptive, to try to find solutions.

Instead of bringing another resolution to the floor that has no chance of passing in the Senate and would be vetoed by the President, we should spend our time trying to come up with creative solutions that would be a win-win-win situation. We can do it. We need to.

It would be nice if the other side of the aisle could also understand what Article I actually means. In the last administration, instead of taking this accord through the normal constitutional process of having it ratified in the Senate and doing it by executive fiat, they have to realize what can be done by executive fiat instead of the constitutional way can be undone by executive fiat.

Rather than now trying to go back to the old document that has questionable efficacy, let us try to move forward.

This is happening all over the place. The State of California has a lot of talk about green talk, yet they have increased their dependence on foreign oil in the last year by 57 percent. That is foreign oil.

We have to do things in a way different than simply talking about it. We had a bunch of hearings in our committee about climate change. We heard from the Hip Hop Caucus. We even heard from people who thought NFL concussions were a problem and needed to be solved somehow through climate change. I don't know how that fit, but it was an interesting day.

Let me try to talk to you instead about something that is in the purview of our government, that can be done and that can be a creative and adaptive solution to this problem of too much carbon in the environment: simply, carbon sequestration.

I would refer you to a guy, a doctor by the name of Williams, who took 1,000 acres of land in Mississippi that had been farmed for 150 years, most of that in cotton. Instead, he turned it into rangeland, grazing rangeland.

He had had no herbicides, no pesticides, no seeding, no artificial fertilizer. The only management technique he used was intensive grazing followed by periods of rest so that the soil, the plant life, could recover. That is the only thing he did.

They tell me that the results after 4 years was simply an increase in the number of foraged species that were there, an increase in the number of native species that were reappearing, and an increase in the general biodiversity of insects and wildlife and everything else.

He told me, in technical talk that I don't understand, that for every 0.6 percent increase in soil C per acre in 1 foot of soil, whatever that means, you can take 35 metric tons of CO₂ out of the atmosphere. That means nothing to me.

What this guy in Mississippi was able to do is come up with a 2.3 percent increase in that soil carbon, I am assuming, which would equate to 140,000 metric tons of CO₂ taken out of the atmosphere. Those numbers also mean nothing to me; I don't know what it means.

What I do understand is that what he was able to do was the equivalent of taking out emissions from 7,600 automobiles every year and sequestering it into his 1,000 acres of ground. That is the equivalent of burning 13,000 tons of coal that he was able to take out of the atmosphere and sequester it into the ground.

Mississippi alone has 10 million acres of land that is farmland of all types. If you were able to use all of that, Mississippi alone could take out of the atmosphere 7 percent of all the emissions that we have and sequester it into their ground in that State simply by itself, which means, if you extend that out mathematically to 150 million acres, the United States could be a net negative emitter. We could be taking more carbon out of the atmosphere and putting it into the ground than we are sending into the atmosphere.

Approximately 5.1, I am told, gigatons of CO₂ emissions are automatically sequestered into the oceans and our terrestrial sinks. If you understand what that means, you are a better man than I am. That is what I have been told. That means, to become net zero, we would only have to have 75 million acres of land being used for carbon sequestration, 75.

In the United States, we have 527 million acres of pasture and rangeland. Twenty-seven percent of the land that we have is in pasture and rangeland. We have 410 million acres, which is 21 percent of all land, in forestry.

Simply by having an aggressive way of grazing, improving grazing and improving the quality of our forests, we can suck carbon out of the atmosphere, which would be far easier and far better than anything in the questionable efficacy of the Paris accord.

You could do it with no cost. You wouldn't have to cost jobs or energy increases. You can do it with virtually no

cost except for the initial cost of buying the livestock to put on the land, which is why it is there.

We could have the benefits of a better watershed, better wildlife, better biodiversity, and economic productivity of our rural lands. All those things are easily within our reach.

We could help solve the food shortage. We could help solve drought resistance in agricultural lands. We could have watershed integrity, which would provide abundant and cleaner water for us all, as well as biodiversity for wildlife.

I was recently in Arkansas, if I can go on with this. The State forestlands, they had 2 pieces that they were working on. One they just let go on so they could see what would happen, let nature run its course. The other they went through with active management by thinning the trees.

What happened in the one that they just left alone? It was crowded. It was dark. There was no sunlight getting to the ground, which was barren of all kinds of foliage.

On the portion that the State managed, where they allowed the sunlight to get to the ground, there was vegetation. There was forage. There was the ability to have food. Wildlife had a habitat they could use.

That has also been replicated in my home State, where on private property, some of my sheep ranchers did the exact same thing. They improved the ground.

Not only have they improved the ground, but they can also now suck more carbon out of the atmosphere into that ground, which you don't do if you just leave it alone.

We had a hearing in our committee one time, and they simply said the idea was that plants need carbon, so you have plant life sucking the carbon out of the atmosphere. It goes down into the root system, which makes the plant healthier, the land healthier, and you are taking carbon out of the atmosphere. That is a wonderful idea.

We had four witnesses. Even the Democratic witnesses were saying that grazing helps us to accomplish this.

One of our good Eastern members said: Well, look, if plant life sucks the carbon out of the atmosphere, why don't we take the cows out, and then you will have more plant life. They won't eat any of it.

Even the Democratic witness said, no, that is not the way it works.

If you allow the plant just to grow, it grows large and sprouts out and hides the ground so that you don't have any kind of new plant life coming on. You take the cows out, and their hooves don't claw up the land as they walk around, so nothing is germinating. All you have is a bunch of dry, dead leaves that are easy bait for wildfires. What you have to do is allow them to eat and then move them off the land.

Can we destroy the land with bad grazing practices? Of course. But if you do it the right way, we can easily solve the problems.

We have two kinds of problems with carbon: one is emissions and the other is concentration, stuff already out there.

If we just do grazing practices and carbon sequestration on the lands that the Federal Government owns now, we can easily not only solve our problem of emissions but take the concentration out and put it back into the ground, where it does good for plant life and expands and grows that.

We have here the resources that we need to solve this problem. What we need to do is free up people to be able to solve this problem by themselves and not insist that the government tell us what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. It doesn't work that way. This can be a win-win situation.

H.R. 9, I am sorry, does not have anybody winning. It has all of us losing. That is why it would be nice to see that there are solutions out there.

All we need to do is be like the old Romans and be a little bit creative and adaptive, find something that works with material we already have. We can do that. There is a better way to go forward than H.R. 9.

H.R. 9 is simply more dogma to try to rehash the past. It doesn't move us forward at all.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. GOSAR for having this Special Order here so we can talk about these kinds of issues as well as the costs that would be involved.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, to the Member, to the gentleman, we are also getting another benefit because the catastrophic wildfires that we are seeing out West are a contributor. There is more carbon and pollution that occurs during these catastrophic wildfires in one day than in a year of exhaust from cars.

What we do is we get a benefit there because we have a much more dynamic forest, much more dynamic interfaces. The fires are smaller. They are not as catastrophic, so we don't go further in debt.

This is something that the Natural Resources Committee has been pushing under Mr. BISHOP's watch, and I thank the gentleman. There is plenty of benefit in regard to understanding the natural cycle of plants and trees.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) is spot-on accurate. I thank him for bringing this up.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I also want to bring up the point that the Western Caucus was dynamic in going to Houston to see Petra Nova in Texas. It is the only carbon sequestration coal plant in the United States, one of only two in the world.

Basically, what they do is they capture the carbon sequestration and pressurize it into pipes. They pipe it down to their oil fields. Once they frack the oil fields, they take this pressurized carbon and force it into the oil field. What it does is it forces out the rest of the gas and oil with it that is still re-

maining and then solidifies in the ground.

What amazing technology. Once again, going back to the whole application that technology, innovation, the private sector is right there to answer the call.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). Mr. LAMALFA knows firsthand the negative effects that policies like H.R. 9 can have, given the proposals that have gone into effect in California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, for hosting this Special Order on this important topic and for his very good work on the Congressional Western Caucus.

As we know, this week, the House will vote on H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. In light of the United States' incredible efforts and achievements in becoming more energy independent and a global leader in energy development and production, we should call it the U.S. Energy Disadvantage Act.

This shortsighted legislation would seek to prevent President Trump from withdrawing from the misguided 2016 Paris Agreement enacted by President Obama. Of course, this agreement was passed without consent from Congress and no economic impact or cost-benefit analysis.

The American people deserve to know what a plan like this is going to cost them. According to several reports, the Paris Agreement could cost the U.S. \$250 billion and 2.7 million jobs by just 2025 and many more jobs over a longer period, and even as much as \$3 trillion by 2040.

Furthermore, this bill is completely one-sided. It received no congressional hearings or feedback from the administration, stakeholders, or outside experts.

Bottom line, this bill would result in an unfair economic playing field against the United States and in favor of all the other countries.

We have already seen the results of this agreement in the city of Paris itself, where protests have erupted over their own gas price increases.

Just like the Green New Deal boondoggle, enacting this legislation would have an almost insignificant effect on decreasing global emissions. Indeed, the United States is already by far the leader in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and has lowered our levels of emissions by 18 percent between 2000 and 2014, leading other major countries and producers.

Why do we need to be in the Paris accord when we are already leading the way? We need to drag the others along in this process and have them do more about their own emissions, such as China, which emits more carbon dioxide than the U.S. and the European Union combined.

Why are they let off the hook in this until the year 2030? Why is India let off the hook until 2030? I guess American consumers and the higher prices they

are paying at the pump, especially Californians at over \$4, would like to know the answer to that question.

It is another attack by the left to undermine the responsible production of energy in America. We don't need to be in the accord to achieve these reductions, as we have already seen these results.

If forced to stay in the Paris climate agreement, the U.S. economy will suffer while achieving no meaningful benefits or reduction in global emissions.

This is like many climate change schemes that are focused on transferring power via taxation and regulation to the government away from the producers of this country.

□ 1445

Are we going to have the power in the hands of elected officials and bureaucrats or the people that innovate better ways of doing things, better forms of energy, and more efficient forms of energy, and have them produced right here in the U.S., including California, which is a leading producer of energy?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this measure and any other climate change scheme that hurts our economy and our energy production when we are the innovators of doing things better around the world.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER). With his background in the technology industry, he knows firsthand how businesses in his district and across the country are already innovating and helping to reduce our carbon emissions.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the members of the Western Caucus for this important Special Order.

Let me start by saying that my home State of Idaho has been a good example of how to utilize renewable energy resources.

According to the Energy Information Administration, in 2017, 82 percent of Idaho's net electricity generation came from renewable energy sources, and 60 percent was supplied by hydroelectric power.

Idaho's use of renewable energy technology came about because we are blessed with bountiful natural resources in our State. But, Mr. Speaker, not every State is blessed with those renewable natural resources and many have to rely on nonrenewable sources of energy.

However, because the Federal Government controls 63 percent of the land in Idaho, many of those resources are not accessible and, all too often, literally go up in smoke.

Sole Federal control of resources inhibits economic growth, harms the environment, and has created numerous obstacles for our citizens due to inadequate management.

H.R. 9 and the Paris Agreement represent a similar obstacle to every State and every district my colleagues represent.

H.R. 9 would reinstate the one-size-fits-all mandates of the Paris Agreement and require the U.S. to drastically change the only ways that we generate electricity.

What has enabled the United States to lead the world in reducing carbon emissions is locally-driven solutions that fit the need of our local citizens, whether it be clean, liquid natural gas in Texas, hydropower in Idaho, or solar facilities in Arizona.

The Paris Agreement is an attack on our national sovereignty and received no congressional input when it was enacted in 2015. In fact, we are one of only 12 countries that signed the agreement that did not include their legislative branch in that adoption process. Mr. Speaker, even China's legislature was consulted in the adoption of the agreement.

The flawed Paris Agreement has committed the United States to getting billions of dollars to the Green Climate Fund while many countries don't contribute at all. All too often, that money ends up in the hands of governments who have no intention of using it to reduce their carbon emissions.

This agreement forces jobs to relocate to areas with the poorest environmental records, like China, which only makes matters worse. Instead of focusing on spending money paying for projects to reduce carbon emissions in other countries, the Democrat majority in this House should focus on the immediate pressures facing this country, like border security and healthcare reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this terrible proposal.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Idaho for those remarks. You can see where this is going. The right way is not this Paris accord, but through technology and through innovation.

Mr. Speaker, a point that has been brought up multiple times by my colleagues is how the Paris Agreement is a direct violation of our Nation's sovereignty. I could not agree more. Article II, section 2 of the Constitution states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

President Obama took unilateral action when he signed the Paris Agreement back in 2015 and failed to consult Congress. There were no committee hearings leading up to the adoption of the agreement and no vote was held by the Senate, as mandated by our Constitution.

Members on the other side will say that the Paris Agreement does not constitute a treaty. But when the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on this very bill, every witness believed the agreement was a treaty. This included multiple Democratic witnesses.

The practice of avoiding congressional approval was nothing new for the Obama administration when it

came to natural resources and energy policy.

Fortunately, Members will have a chance to correct this unconstitutional action by voting for my amendment that was made in order this week instructing the Senate to take a vote as to whether the Paris Agreement is a treaty or not.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), my good friend. He has some background on this information.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Part of what happened was that they danced through a lot of different hoops to try to make sure that they didn't have to have it be a treaty. If they could at least make the argument that it was not a treaty, because they knew they couldn't get Senate confirmation.

And, in fact, the Democrat champion, Senator Pell, who was the chairman at the time of the appropriate committee, actually put in their committee report that should there later be a conference—and they were talking about the original conference that we had entered into, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which this is not an extension of—many people say it is, but they had to adopt all new rules and all new aspects, because they knew they couldn't just add this on to the original one.

But Senator Pell says, "The committee notes that a decision by the conference of the parties"—referencing the U.N. commission—"to adopt targets and timetables would have to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before the United States could deposit its instruments of ratification for such an agreement."

Now, the Paris accord, the Paris treaty, ostensibly says that there are targets and timetables. But even the Democrats recognized in 1992 that if you were to put in targets and timetables, you had to have that document submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. So, a decision by the conference to adopt targets and timetables would have to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before the United States could deposit its instruments of ratification for such an agreement.

Clearly, they anticipated that someday there might be timetables and targets and they wanted to make sure that everybody knew that in 1992, just because we joined that conference, did not mean that we had agreed to later being bound to timetables and targets.

Now, we are doing very well on those timetables and targets without having announced we are leaving. And even if we are not a member of the Paris accord, agreement, treaty, whatever you end up calling it, we are doing very well at reducing our carbon footprint.

The Chinese are producing about twice as much carbon dioxide as we are today. They have the number two economy and we have the number one economy per job, and from a production

standpoint we are doing a lot better. They are not even bound until 2030 under this so-called treaty agreement. But it is very clear that in order to bind us to anything, it had to be approved by the Senate and it has not been approved by the Senate.

So, what we are arguing about, in essence, is merely a political point for the people on the other side of the aisle, because these targets, as they currently exist without ratification from the Senate, are merely suggestions. We are doing what we can in a reasonable way. We need to do more on research so that we can continue to have the jobs and have the wealth and be the number one economic nation and continue to reduce our carbon footprint.

Now, I've got to tell you, I get a little amazed sometimes at some of these folks, because the World Bank decided they weren't going to invest in any more coal-fired power plants—now I know I am going off subject, but let me run. The World Bank decided they weren't going to invest in any more coal-fired power plants. The top ten donors to the World Bank include nine western countries and Japan. So, basically, the west and Japan decided that they were not going to invest in those things. So guess who is investing? You can guess.

Mr. GOSAR. Russia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. It is China. And Russia is probably doing some, too. But China is heavily out there. And they are getting a two-for because the developing world, particularly sub-Saharan Africa, want to have power and energy for their people, because they want their people to not live in the dark and have electricity. They want their people to have jobs. They know that in order to have better jobs, they have got to have electricity in their country across the board, not just in the big cities. They have got to have a source of power, and they have coal. For them, that is their most affordable source.

So what the Chinese are doing, they are basically laughing at us. We are going to agree to these timetables that haven't been ratified by the Senate and these targets, while they get to continue increasing. Even though they are the number two economy in the world, they are going to continue to increase their carbon footprint, and they are going to build coal-fired power plants in sub-Saharan Africa for which they get a lot of goodwill in the foreign affairs and foreign relations department. But wait, there is more.

In many of these cases—I can't say all, but the ones I have read about—they are, for a fee, going to run those coal-fired power plants for the nations that they are building them in. So not only are they going to build goodwill and good relations around the world using coal in contravention of these goals set forth in the Paris accord, but they are going to make a profit at it, as well.

Mr. GOSAR. Absolutely. The one road initiative. They are taking and leveraging resources across the world and, at the same time, being paid for it. And I dare you not keep up with your payments because it rescinds right back to them.

Going back to your first point, the gentleman from Virginia, what you are telling me is that this body will have that opportunity, with my amendment, to get this right, instructing the Senate to take a vote on the Paris accord to actually see if it can become a treaty, would you agree?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Well, your amendment would certainly do that, and I will support that amendment. While I can't support the underlying bill, I can support that amendment because that does make the underlying bill better. If we are going to bind our hands and seal our fate to be the number two or number three or number five economy in the world, instead of being the number one economy in the world, if that is what we are going to do, then there ought to be votes taken down the hall. Men and women in the United States Senate should put their name on the line and say yes or no. The American people then will know who has voted yes and who has voted no. They won't be hiding behind any games or circumstances or procedural maneuvers. Then the American people can use the power that was given to them by our Constitution and an inalienable right granted by God to use the ballot box to make a decision as to whether or not they wanted to be bound, whether or not they wanted to have their economy reduced, and have their children and grandchildren to be lesser than what we have today in our economic wealth.

Mr. GOSAR. So, what you are really telling me is when you have good process, you build good policy, which builds good politics. It is kind of that simple, isn't it?

Mr. GRIFFITH. It is that simple. You shouldn't hide behind games or trickery to say, well, this is not really a treaty that has to go to the Senate because the targets are merely aspirational. If they are merely aspirational, why are we spending billions of dollars on it and why are we participating at all, which I think was the President's point.

Why would we spend billions of dollars to send to countries, some of whom might actually be kleptocracies, and the money is never getting to where it is supposed to go? Why would we spend billions of dollars on something that we know is not going to be effective? Let's spend our billions of dollars on research and find new technologies.

You may have heard me tell the story, because it has been my favorite story the last couple of weeks, but I have a professor at Virginia Tech who has been working on technology to separate coal from rare Earth minerals. But there is a side effect. It also can make poor coal better coal. And they are selling that technology.

Now they are licensing a company in India for two steel mills—steel, for those who don't speak southwest Virginian, steel mills—and they are licensing them to use this technology, so they can take Indian coal and make it better and then reduce their carbon footprint and still produce the steel.

The Indians aren't going to say they are not going to use the coal and we are not going to produce steel. They want what everybody wants. They want a better economy. They want jobs. They want those people in their country—and I understand there are hundreds of millions—who don't have electricity to have electricity in their homes.

Like everybody else, they want clean air and clean water, too. But it is not going to happen by an edict of the Paris accord. It is going to happen by research that makes sense and that economically says you can have the steel to build new factories, to build new cities, to build new things in your country to make your country better, wherever you are: sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, Europe, America, South America, North America, wherever you are. But you can do it better and you can do it cleaner and you can do it where it is cost effective. That is what we have to focus on, not arbitrary, capricious goals set with different countries having different standards. As an American, as U.S. citizens, we have a higher target, and there is no target for the Chinese.

□ 1500

Mr. GOSAR. The gentleman brings up that when we look at coal, the separation of rare earths, that is the technology that is so important. This is the technology that is driving this renaissance of technology in our country, that plethora of energy where we can geopolitically decide to help other countries become more independent, away from China's and from Russia's jurisdiction.

The entrepreneurial spirit is bred with having energy independence. This H.R. 9 kills jobs.

I also want to bring up to the gentleman, with technology, there is another technology at the same time that takes up pulverized coal and infuses it into oil. When they burn it, they get a 50 percent additional Btu factor and a cleaner burning application, once again reducing the carbon footprint.

Once again, talking about new technologies is what saves us. It is that entrepreneurial spirit making things better. The infusion of new technology helps us get an advancement of cleaner technology.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, what is exciting for the American people, what is exciting for me, I would say to the gentleman, is that we have just mentioned a couple of areas where technology is working, making things better, and reducing our carbon footprint. In our universities and our think tanks across the country, there are hundreds

and thousands of ideas percolating out there that can help us move forward.

You may not agree with me on this, but I think we can spend more money from the Federal Government on research to find better ways to use fossil fuels. Wave energy, wind, solar, whatever it is, we need to be leading on the research end of this.

If we think we are going to eliminate fossil fuels, Mr. Speaker, we are mistaken, because the world is going to continue to use fossil fuels. If you say to a developing economy that they have to rely on wind, they are going to know that you are full of hot wind.

Mr. GOSAR. That is right.

Mr. GRIFFITH. If you say to them, however, that we are going to try to do all of the above, so we are going to help you burn the coal you have; we are going to help you find the fuels that work for you, but we want to try to help you do it in a cleaner fashion; and we want to make that coal a little bit better, to make that oil a little bit better, to make it burn hotter, to make it burn more efficiently, that is how you lower your carbon footprint.

I like what the gentleman from Utah had to talk about in grazing on our Federal lands. If we started using different techniques, we can absorb a lot of carbon. We should probably spend some research money to find out if those crops and those plants that can be utilized to suck up more carbon can maybe produce other products as well.

These are things that we need to do, instead of saying we are not going to use any of this in the future because we might do that to the detriment of our jobs here in the United States. We are going to shift those jobs to other countries where they will use dirtier coal, dirtier oil, dirtier techniques for burning fossil fuels to produce the products that we then buy back, making them the richer nations in the world and we the lesser.

When I am on my deathbed, I want to be able to look my kids in the eye—hopefully, I will have grandkids some day—and say: You know what? We kept the United States of America number one in the economic situation, and we looked out for the planet at the same time.

It can be done, but it can't be done if all you say is, no, we are not going to look at fossil fuels.

Mr. GOSAR. The gentleman brings up a great point, along with the former chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, not only in the grazing application but in the stewardship of our natural resources called our forests, dynamic forests. Instead of being victims of these catastrophic wildfires that put so much of the emissions and pollution into the air, we then relegate it, so when we do have fires, it is relegated to low-level type fires that are not as devastating and catastrophic.

I want to bring up one other point. Included in the Paris Agreement was the creation of a slush fund called the Green Climate Fund, which the Obama

administration unconstitutionally utilized to shift \$1 billion in taxpayer funds without authorization from Congress. Once again, we were imposed upon by having the money, Uncle Sam Warbucks.

The Green Climate Fund was a goal of raising \$100 billion a year through voluntary contributions from countries that signed the Paris Agreement. While developed countries are expected to finance their respective agreements under the Paris Agreement, the Green Climate Fund aims to subsidize the agreements of developing countries that cannot afford the commitments they made when signing the Paris Agreement.

In fact, since the United States ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992, the United States has given hundreds of millions of dollars to developing countries to help them mitigate climate change. Amazing.

We know that much of the money we have given over the years has gone to some of the most corrupt countries in the world. My question is, how can we rely on these countries to spend the money properly? When you look, for example, in 2014, the top recipients for climate funds all received failing grades in Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index. Amazing.

What has been the return on investment for the money that we were giving to these countries? It is nice to be able to fund this, but what are the results? What are we getting from that?

Mr. GRIFFITH. If the gentleman would tell me.

Mr. GOSAR. The facts are that carbon emissions from the developing countries have gone up. We know that much of the money was not used to reduce carbon emissions.

Once again, we are not solving it.

It is clear that H.R. 9, that is what it will do. It will put the country back on the road to job losses, higher electric bills, and more government regulations while wasting significant amounts of taxpayer money in the process.

We become victims in this economy. We should be leading the way. Freedom comes with technology and opportunity, and that is what the American people want.

This is something where we should show the way by leadership, by saying: Listen, follow us by the way that we do things.

That seems like a better approach, doesn't it, to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, it absolutely is a better approach. It really does bother me that we are just handing cash over to these countries.

As you said, they don't have transparency. Some of them are known to have corrupt governments, which means that at least a portion of that money is probably ending up in the pockets of the rulers' friends, neighbors, and cousins.

If we are going to spend the money, let's go in and spend the money on something that will make a difference for the folks in those countries.

I am not saying as the richest nation in the world that we don't have a responsibility, but let's make sure that we don't cripple ourselves in the process. Let's make sure that if we are going to spend the money, which I am okay with spending some of it, that we make sure it is going to projects that will improve the environment in those countries and help lower the carbon footprint in those respective nations.

They are not going to sit back and have their people be impoverished just because a group of Western nations got together or a group of nations got together that already have some money and said: You stop using fossil fuels so that the world won't get warmer.

They may be concerned about that, and I think they probably are, but they are not going to impoverish their people to target 1.5 degrees centigrade.

If we can show them a way to get more wealth for their people, to bring electricity to all regions of their countries, and to lower their carbon footprint, they are all in. That is where we can lead.

We don't have to spend money by just handing cash to potentates around the world. We can spend that money on research right here in our own colleges, in our own universities, in our own think tanks with people. Some of them will fail, but some of them will come up with new technology. Like when looking for a way to separate rare earth from coal and they figure out a way to lower the carbon footprint at steel mills in India, those kinds of things happen when you are looking for answers to problems instead of looking for problems.

Mr. GOSAR. Right, the carrot versus the whip. What you are looking at is the opportunity for solutions, that incentivization to find a new opportunity. I think that is the value. We are protecting 6.5 million jobs here.

It scraps the unconstitutional application of the treaty, and it ensures safe, reliable, affordable energy.

Everybody has to have energy. When we start looking at this Paris accord, it is accomplished in so many different ways that H.R. 9 is not something that is a valid or constitutional agreement.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOSAR. Having said that, the Paris Agreement may have been their most egregious breach of constitutional authority. Many Members on the other side have stated in the past that President Trump does not have the authority to unilaterally withdraw the United States without the consent of Congress.

By virtue of the executive's role as the sole organ of the government charged with making official communications with foreign states, it is responsible for communicating the United States' intention to withdraw

from international agreements and political commitments.

In the case of this executive agreement, President Obama had independent authority to enter into an executive agreement. President Trump may also independently terminate the agreement without congressional approval.

In addition to there being no congressional input on the agreement, there was no congressional input when drafting the agreement. This is not the way an agreement as wide-reaching as the Paris Agreement should have been agreed upon.

Passage of H.R. 9 will bring us back to the foreign policy of President Obama and the practice of putting other countries' interests above our own. This is the same foreign policy that brought us Benghazi, the rise of ISIS, and the disastrous Iran nuclear agreement.

President Trump's promise to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement marked a dramatic change in America's foreign policy—for the better, I might add. The Paris Agreement fails to put America first, and President Trump is right to withdraw us from this sovereignty-sacrificing agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are becoming clearer about the realities and failures of the Paris climate agreement.

First of all, let's talk about the good news. The United States reduced its carbon emissions by 40 million metric tons in 2017. Yes, our emissions did rise slightly in 2018 due to increased domestic manufacturing, but the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects that our carbon emissions will continue to fall in 2019 and 2020.

Now for some bad news. The United States' reductions in carbon emissions are totally erased when you account for China's dramatic increase in carbon emissions. Several speakers have talked about that. In fact, China's increase in emissions is three times larger than the U.S.'s decrease in emissions.

Mr. Speaker, this highlights two of the fundamental failures in the framework of the Paris Agreement, which is the fact that there are no mechanisms in place to hold countries accountable for not reaching their emissions reduction targets, and there are no requirements or required countries to establish equitable emissions reductions over the same period.

It is not just China, either. India, for example, saw its emissions rise 4.8 percent in 2017. Forty-seven of the 50 most polluted cities in the world are located in either China or in India.

Well, you may say, let's look to Europe. They are probably on the forefront of following the standards set forth in the agreement.

People would think that, but that would be wrong, as all EU countries are off-target in reaching the goals set forth by the Paris Agreement. Germany, for example, has spent almost

\$600 billion in renewable energy subsidies and has seen no meaningful decrease in carbon emissions.

Mr. Speaker, the United States was already a leader in reducing carbon emissions before the Paris Agreement was signed. Since 1970, the United States has reduced six key air pollutants by 73 percent and has seen the largest absolute reduction of CO₂ of any country in the world since 2000.

Instead of focusing on bringing us back to the past, we should focus on encouraging innovations that we are already seeing in the energy sector today. Whether it be carbon capture technology, clean coal, or taking advantage of the liquid natural gas revolution that is taking place across the country, the private sector is leading the way in creating a cleaner energy future for this country.

That is the way it should be, not through a heavy-handed government imposing unrealistic, top-down mandates.

Requiring the U.S. to follow the requirements of the Paris Agreement will stifle innovations and return us to the policies of the past when energy was more expensive and economic growth was abysmal.

It appears that I am running out of time, so what I will do is implore my folks to, first, relook at this.

I thank all the Western Caucus members who contributed to the Special Order. It is truly a privilege to be chair of the caucus, which is now 74 bipartisan members strong.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to lead the fight against the extreme agenda, which is why we organized the Special Order in opposition to H.R. 9.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I will close with a quote from the National Federation of Independent Business, who oppose this legislation.

Under this legislation,

Small businesses would face significant future government mandates, additional regulatory and legal burdens, and unworkable government policies that would result in skyrocketing energy prices.

At a time when the small business economy is booming with small business owners reporting record hiring of new employees and historically strong compensation increases for their employees, Congress should be considering policies that will allow this economic boom to continue, not bring it to a halt.

I hope this legislation is voted down by the House this week and we get serious as a Congress about promoting energy dominance for the betterment of our economy, energy consumers, the environment, and geopolitically across the world.

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

PARIS ACCORDS WERE FLAWED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, years ago, the administration, working through an international group, had helped to negotiate and put together an agreement on climate change known as the Kyoto Protocol. That protocol was resoundingly rejected by the United States Senate.

It actually had provisions in it that indicated that should the United States in the future end up entering into some sort of climate agreement or any type of agreement, that there would have to be some type of a consent by the United States Senate; that this would have to be presented before the United States Senate.

We don't have a unilateral government. We don't have a dictatorship. We have scenario whereby we have a Congress, we have a President, and we work together. In this case what has happened is, under the Obama administration, these Paris accords were agreed to unilaterally, meaning they were never submitted to the Congress. They were never submitted to the United States Senate for approval.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the American people have their Representatives. Their Representative is their Senator, and that is how their voice is heard on agreements like this.

Yet, we had a President that unilaterally agreed to the Paris accords and did not submit it to the United States Senate. So now we have a President that is saying: Well, this was unilaterally agreed to. I am unilaterally withdrawing.

We have a bill this week, H.R. 9, that attempts to prevent the President from withdrawing from this. So I want to stick with procedure here for just a minute, Mr. Speaker.

We unilaterally entered into an agreement that we don't believe should have been entered into unilaterally. We think it should have been presented to the United States Senate. It was not.

Now the President is saying, I am withdrawing. And now this bill is trying to prevent that. So, on the one hand they think that a President should be able to unilaterally act, and in another scenario, the withdrawal that President Trump has proposed, you have folks saying with H.R. 9 that, no, no, you can't do that. You can't have both. One or the other, take your pick.

Now, let's actually get into the contents of the agreement. The Paris accords set targets on emissions reductions for the United States. All right, so they try and set emissions reductions.

Mr. Speaker, under this agreement, we could eliminate all emissions from the United States, all greenhouse gases. We can eliminate all of them, and China can come in and they can emit 10 times what we were emitting before we cut. Under this agreement that is totally legal. It doesn't make sense.

To add insult to injury, China can go years and years increasing emissions; not reducing, increasing. I want to remind you, we live in a global environment. As much as we like to think we are the only country in the world, we are not. It is a global environment. If you care about the whole environment for the entire globe, you have got to look holistically.

You can't come to the United States and say: Okay, you have to cut emissions. Yet, in China, they can double, triple, they can go tenfold increasing their emissions, twentyfold increasing their emissions, and that is all legal under this agreement. That is inappropriate. If we care about the global environment, let's care about the global environment.

Now, to add insult to injury, the agreement also establishes an entirely different metric for developing countries like China than it does for the United States.

Now, think about this, if we are in the Olympics; we are running a race, and you win the race. But then somebody comes, and they say: No, no we are giving this Chinese runner a 20-second deduction. That is not fair. And that is what has happened here.

They have an entirely different metric that they are measured by. Why? If we live in a global environment, if we care about overall reducing emissions, why are we giving different standards, different measurements? That is inappropriate. This entire agreement is flawed.

Now, some of you may be sitting there thinking: Well, wait a minute. I care about the environment. I care about emissions reduction.

Let me read you a statement that was included in the International Energy Agency's Global Energy & CO₂ Status Report.

Here is the statement: "Emissions in the United States remain around their 1990 levels, 14 percent and 800 metric tons of CO₂ below their peak in 2000."

Now, here is the kicker. Listen to this statement. "This is the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000."

I am going to say that again. "This is the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000."

Let me translate that, Mr. Speaker. What that means is that the United States, over the last, nearly 20 years, has reduced emissions greater than every other country.

So, we are actually operating without a requirement, just with an incentive. We are operating on already reducing emissions. We are already transitioning to an all-of-the-above energy strategy which includes solar, which includes wind, which includes geothermal, which includes hydro, and nuclear, and natural gas, and coal, and oil, and other things, all of the above, whichever makes the most sense.

We had a hearing today in the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and it was fascinating listening to people

talking about the impact of these energy policies on the poor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the home State where I am from, south Louisiana, we have the lowest electricity rates in the United States, the lowest. The States that have the highest are the ones that are forcing things that are perverting or distorting markets. Those are the States that have the highest electricity rates. That disproportionately affects the poor.

We were citing today an analysis by the Manhattan Institute. In that analysis, they looked at if you invested \$1 million and you could invest it in solar, you could invest it in wind, or you could invest it in natural gas and shale—I see my friend here from North Dakota that represents much of the shale production in the United States—you would get a sixfold increase in the amount of energy produced by investing it in shale.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, transitioning to natural gas results in a significant reduction in emissions as compared to other sources. It is part of our existing infrastructure. It is part of a transition plan. And not to say that we don't ever transition or continue migrating to renewable sources; it is all of the above.

Don't say all of the above, as President Obama and others did, but then carry out policies that prevent you or drive up the cost of these other energy sources. It doesn't make sense and that is what disproportionately affects the poor.

Mr. Speaker, we have other Members here from the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, and I appreciate them being here. I am looking forward to engaging with them on bringing reality, bringing practicality to this discussion today.

But I want to say in summary: number one, procedurally, the Paris accords were flawed. Practically speaking, the targets that were established disproportionately affect the United States, and it establishes a different measuring stick, a different standard for us than it does for China and other countries.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, China, the country that is here under the auspices of a developing Nation, this is the country that is spending billions and billions of dollars around the world on projects in other countries to improve their national security, their defense, contrary, in many cases, to the United States and our allies. This is a developing country. This is inappropriate.

And I will say one last thing in closing. We are the country that over nearly the last 20 years has had the greatest reduction in emissions and we have done it by incentivizing, not by coming in and distorting markets and putting perverse policies in place.

H.R. 9 is a flawed approach that is going to have a disproportionate impact on the poor. It is going to simply squeeze a balloon in the middle and make it pop out on the sides where you

have more emissions resulting in China and other countries. Because companies will leave the United States, jobs will leave the United States if we address this inappropriately, and they will go to other countries where they will be less energy efficient. They will release greater emissions into our global environment. That is not a win.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of H.R. 9. I urge support of involving the United States Senate, the United States Congress in these discussions and negotiations, and to develop a true all-of-the-above energy strategy that incorporates things like incentives, thinks about our infrastructure network and other important components of ultimately achieving this objective, which we all share, which is giving a better planet to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman BUDDY CARTER, that, similar to me, represents a coastal district.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for hosting this today. This is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege of representing the First Congressional District of Georgia, a district that includes the entire coast of Georgia, over 100 miles of pristine coastline. We are very proud.

The coast of Georgia is my home. That is where I have lived all of my life, where I was born, and I was raised, and where I intend to live the rest of my life. I love the coast of Georgia, and I have always said that I am going to protect the coast of Georgia, and I am.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is real. Protecting our environment is real. We understand that. Since day one, the climate has been changing. Yes, industrialization has had an impact on it as well. We understand that.

In order to represent my constituents, I believe our Nation needs to be working in a responsible way, a responsible way to prepare ourselves for future weather events while striving for cleaner and more affordable energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, in an 11-month period, we had two major hurricanes on the Georgia coast: Hurricane Matthew and Hurricane Irma. The number of hurricanes appears to be increasing and there are those who would argue that the intensity of those hurricanes are increasing. That is something we are concerned with.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, as well as on the Environment Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and that is very important. That is where I need to be as the Representative of the coast of Georgia. I need to be on those committees. This is where I want to be.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, to address this problem, the majority party, the Democrats, have offered H.R. 9. It is coming to the floor this week and it is not a solution. It is not a solution to climate change.

What it is, is government overreach at its best. It disallows the President from withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement. It puts our economy, our national security, and our ability to make our environment cleaner in danger, while other nations, as was pointed out by my colleague from Louisiana, other nations just simply continue on. They aren't held by these same principles.

□ 1530

China right now is responsible for 30 percent of the pollution in the world, and yet they aren't abiding by this. They aren't even a part of the Paris climate agreement. They are not even participating in this until 2030.

As my colleague pointed out, again, they can just continue to increase pollution while here in America, if the President is not allowed to get us out of this climate agreement, we are going to have to adhere to that. That is not fair, and it is not going to help if China is not held to the same principles that we are held to.

Mr. Speaker, between the year 2000 and 2014, the United States decreased emissions by more than 14 percent, in fact, by more than 18 percent, but China's emissions have increased. They have doubled since the year 2000, and they are significantly higher than the U.S. right now.

The U.S. is already leading the way without the Paris climate agreement. We are leading the way. We are the economic leader, and we can't let a half-baked policy like H.R. 9 jeopardize that status.

Companies in our country are responsible, and they are leading the way. As my colleague from Louisiana mentioned, we had a meeting earlier today of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. We had witnesses who told us about companies that are involved in this that already, on their own accord and on their own initiative, are doing things and putting in place programs that are going to help with climate change.

For example, there is a startup called 4Oceanis that has collected 4.2 million pounds of ocean garbage. If we put our economy at risk through expensive regulations and mandates, then we risk losing companies like this and the capital that they have necessary to invest in these projects.

As my colleagues stated earlier, we have to have an all-of-the-above approach. In order to control climate change, we need three things: We need adaptation; we need mitigation; and we need innovation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9 is bad policy. Again, as my colleague pointed out earlier, it was brought about without even a subcommittee hearing. It was rushed through. This is a very important subject. This is a very important subject that can't be rushed. We can't take this lightly. We have to take this seriously. We are taking it seriously in the Republican Party.

The Democrats didn't think about the real consequences of this bill. Here we have the Green New Deal, pie in the sky that would ruin our economy by \$93 trillion, and it includes things such as healthcare for all. Now, what has that got to do with climate change? Absolutely nothing.

We need to concentrate; we need to focus; and we need to have real, commonsense solutions to this. That is what we are proposing. But here we have politics as usual on Capitol Hill with Democrats bringing this to the floor. They couldn't care less about the impact on our economy or the impacts on real people.

This legislation, H.R. 9, quite frankly, would be better off being called the "U.S. Energy Disadvantage Act." That is what they ought to call it.

Having said all this, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you—and I mean this sincerely—I am excited. I am excited about the future of clean energy. I am excited about the future of innovation in America. We have the greatest innovators in the world right here in America. We have the smartest scientists in the world right here in America. If we simply give them the chance to do their work, then they will do it. I am convinced of that.

Yes, we need to incentivize it and we need to encourage it, but we don't need to be an obstacle, and we don't need to be in the way.

Look at the internet, arguably one of the greatest inventions in modern times. Where did that come from? Right here in America.

I am excited. I am convinced that we can come up with real solutions to this. Unfortunately, H.R. 9 is not one of those real solutions. H.R. 9 is going to ruin our economy.

The Green New Deal, are you kidding me? That kind of pie-in-the-sky type of legislation has no place. We need real solutions. Citizens sent us up here to come up with real solutions, not some pie-in-the-sky idea.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 9 and deliberate on real solutions that will make our world cleaner and improve our environment without destroying our economy.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), who is another member of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, Americans care about clean air; Americans care about clean water; and the U.S. needs to be at the table for these discussions as we move into a global economy. But, Mr. Speaker, a bad deal is worse than no deal at all. Make no mistake, H.R. 9 is a bad deal.

Almost no countries are in compliance with the Paris deal now, let alone its future requirements. I am going to have some breaking news here: China is not a developing country. China emits

over 30 percent of the world's pollution. But not China, not India, not Australia, not the EU, and not even Canada are in compliance with the current terms.

The U.N. Emissions Gap Report estimates U.N. countries will have to triple their efforts to meet the Paris deal commitments. This deal imposes stricter requirements on the United States than other countries. It requires significant and economically damaging carbon emission reductions from the United States without requiring those same requirements from China, from India, and from other developing countries.

A true international agreement to address carbon emissions would require actionable commitments from all the countries and would have included a mechanism for enforcement. China has only committed to raising its nonfossil fuel share of its economy to 20 percent by 2030 and a commitment that CO₂ emissions will peak in 2030. That is not including their financing of essentially unregulated coal plants all over the developing world.

U.S. CO₂ emissions have peaked in the mid-2000s and have decreased since then. The United States is on track to hit about 65 percent of the voluntary targets based on both the Bush- and Obama-era regulations and existing power sector trends.

Mr. Speaker, we need to focus on developing and exporting innovation and technology to reduce emissions; give us cleaner air and water and reliable, affordable energy for families all across the country. Without that, this bill is simply virtue signaling. But it is worse than that because, by its very nature, it will force the exporting of pollution to countries that do not have the United States' regulatory controls.

We benefit from producing energy here. It is done safely and securely and creates American jobs. We need to end our reliance on foreign fuels and promote homegrown and home-produced fuels just like we have done in North Dakota.

The energy sector not only is great for our economy, but it is incredibly important for national security. So let's get on with real solutions. Let's get more pipelines in the ground. Let's allow for natural gas to be burned during the winter instead of heating oil. Let's end sue-and-settle environmentalism, and let's not forget that we had 8 years under the Obama administration to lead environmentally by symbolism and symbolism alone. We need to get rid of symbolism and start working toward action.

Democrats are offering unrealistic, counterproductive policies like stopping pipelines needed to transport environmentally safe natural gas and stopping trains from going into their own States. We need to allow for our energy infrastructure to catch up to where it needs to be, and then we can lead the world in global innovation and technology.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), who represents a lot of the victims of bad energy policy or energy policy that is not thought out.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

I represent West Virginia, an energy State. Our natural resources power the Nation, and our coal produces the steel that is the backbone of our country's infrastructure. The bill my colleagues across the aisle have introduced today is a direct threat to the economy of my State and to the security of our Nation.

When President Obama entered into the Paris Agreement in 2016, he made a shortsighted, hasty decision which passed egregious costs on to American consumers and sent \$1 billion in taxpayer funds to subsidize other nations' energy agendas without congressional authorization—while never offering a clear plan for our country to meet the commitments made, aside from the overall goal of killing energy production in the U.S.

This is an attempt to further the war on coal which decimated my State, killing jobs, destroying businesses, and exacerbating the opioid epidemic. We face a bleakness which we are starting to recover from, yet, now, Washington liberals are restarting the charge.

We have seen unrealistic proposals like the Green New Deal put forward which would not only bankrupt our country, but also kill our energy industry once and for all. I will not stand here and let that happen.

When President Trump withdrew from the agreement in 2017, he showed leadership. He showed the world that he was willing to resist diplomatic pressure in order to protect American interests and ensure energy competitiveness.

Those who support this legislation aren't telling the whole story on America's energy production. The Paris Agreement, since its creation, has not accounted for the United States' abundance of natural resources and the hundreds of thousands of Americans employed by the energy industry.

Additionally, the Paris Agreement ignores that America produces affordable, reliable energy, including coal, oil, and natural gas, and it also ignores the importance that energy has to the United States' economy and national security.

In the past 5 years, there has been a 110 percent increase in coal exports, and we still have 259 billion tons of coal reserves, the largest in the world.

Since 2008, the U.S. has increased crude oil production by 48 percent and natural gas production by 53 percent; and looking forward, the increased access to undeveloped energy production could create as many as 690,000 jobs by 2030.

Energy has been our past, and energy is our future. It is important the United States is already leading the world in reducing greenhouse emissions through innovation and technological development. If my colleagues across the aisle were interested in working with Republicans to address climate change, then they would not ignore the fact that the United States has already had the largest absolute decline of carbon emissions among all the countries since the year 2000.

We did not need an international agreement to do it. Forcing America to reenter the Paris Agreement is not the answer for climate concerns. It is re-starting a tried-and-failed approach which only leads to less jobs, a weaker economy, and a less safe America.

The answer to the climate debate is not a \$93 trillion socialist restructuring of our country. It is innovation, and it is supporting new technology like taking rare-earth minerals and distilled water from previously used coal ash. It is supporting carbon capture moving forward. It is recognizing that, in the dead of winter when the renewable energy grids fall short, we can rely on coal to get us through the next polar vortex.

America cannot afford to reenter the Paris Agreement. We cannot afford to lose jobs. We cannot afford to lose security. We cannot afford the security risks. We cannot afford to weaken our economy. And we cannot afford to say “no” to innovation.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I will now close.

Mr. Speaker, it has been fascinating serving on the House Natural Resources Committee, where we have talked about efforts to stop pipelines from being built under the auspices of this is protecting our environment.

Mr. Speaker, study after study has shown that, when you stop pipelines, it doesn't stop the utilization of oil and gas. What it does is it puts that on barges, on trains, and on trucks—less safe means of transportation. The safest thing you can do is put energy in a pipeline. If you care about the environment, that is what you should do.

Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing recently in the Natural Resources Committee where we had a career Department of the Interior official. We talked to him and asked him: What happens when you try and stop the supply of energy? Does that reduce the demand for oil and gas?

Do you know what the response was? This person has served in at least the Clinton administration, all of these different Republican and Democratic administrations. He said: No. As a matter of fact, we have researched this extensively. What it does is it causes us to import more energy.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you of some of the top nations we would import from:

Venezuela, Middle Eastern countries, and Nigeria. We are giving them billions of dollars.

To put it in perspective on how much this is, Mr. Speaker, in 2011, 58 percent of our Nation's trade deficit was attributable to our importing energy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear. I am going to reiterate what my friend from Georgia said.

I have children. I care about the environment. I taught outdoor education classes for years, and I care about the environment.

□ 1545

I care about the environment. I know that facts can be pesky little things, but we have to introduce more science and data into these decisions to make sure that we are making informed, deliberate decisions that result in a better global environment, not simply coming in and squeezing the United States to the benefit of China where they end up releasing greater emissions into our global environment.

That is a flawed strategy. It is what this bill, H.R. 9, would do. I urge, once again, rejection of this flawed approach.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, let me take a quick moment and sort of get adjusted here.

We are going to spend a couple of minutes walking through some things that I think are exciting, hopeful, and worth getting our heads around.

Every week, I try to come to this microphone when we are here to talk about what I believe makes the future really bright for all of us, everyone from my 3-year-old—or 3½-year-old, as she corrects me—little girl to someone who is moving into their retirement years.

Once again, what is the greatest fragility in our society? This is one that is hard for us to get our heads around or even talk about. It is our demographics.

Whether we like it or not, baby boomers are retiring, and we have 74 million baby boomers. The last baby boomer will hit 65 in about 8½ years.

In 8½ years, two workers, one retiree. In 8½ years, 50 percent of our spending from this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and up.

It is demographics. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is demographics.

At the same time, we have a substantial collapse, fall, in our birthrates. As you know, our birthrates now are well below the replacement rates.

What do you do as a society? What do you do as a government? What do we do as a body here that is making public policy to make the future bright?

We keep coming to the floor and talking about that we believe there are, functionally, five elements. It is the adoption of technology. It is the adoption of economic policies that maximize economic growth through tax policy that creates investment in new technology for productivity; immigration policy that maximizes new Americans having talents that help us grow the economy; regulatory policy that uses technology and information to regulate instead of bureaucratic filing in file cabinets, functionally; incentives to stay in the workforce and incentives to enter the workforce.

As we have seen recently, millennial females are moving into the workforce. We still have a problem with millennial males.

How about someone who is older? Can we do certain incentives in Social Security, Medicare, and other earned benefits to encourage staying in the workforce or even creating a second career? We are going to have to redesign a bit of those incentives that are in the current earned benefits.

Can you create some incentives on Social Security, saying, “If you will continue to work, we are going to do these things?” Because that labor force participation is so important.

We have worked through these. Now we try to come in and show what we see working in our society. Then, I want to talk a little bit about one of these things, and that is the adoption of technology.

This week, the majority, the Democrats, will have a resolution on the floor about the Paris climate accords. I want to walk a bit through how technology, pro-growth technology, is the solution. I am going to show you some of the really optimistic things happening out there.

Let's start swapping a couple of these boards. First, I apologize for the first slide. The scale is a little off, but it is basically to make a simple point.

I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee. We had the debate in December 2017. Over here, I was hearing how the world was coming to an end, how revenues were going to collapse. It turns out that now we at least have a good, comparable dataset. What is the term? “*Ceteris paribus*,” where you can equal to equal.

In 2017, before there was tax reform, the first 6 months, and now we have the 2019 first 6 months. Guess what? Revenues are up, even though we are already in the tax reform environment.

I was waved off by some much more sensitive staffers. We had a list of quotes from the majority, things they said, their predictions, what their economists said. I am not going to read them.

But do understand, think about some of the crazy things we heard about what tax reform was going to do to the revenues of the country, what it was going to do to the economy, what it was going to do to employment, what it was going to do to labor force participation.

They were all wrong. It is working. Take a look at our economic growth. Take a look at unemployment.

If I had come to you a couple of years ago before tax reform and said our society is going to have more jobs than we have available workers, what would you have said?

But it is reality. It is happening. We are seeing data within what they call the U-6, the underlying parts of the unemployment statistics of our brothers and sisters who have handicaps, who have been long-term unemployed, who have other life difficulties, moving into the labor force.

There should be joy in this body and also joy for the fact that all the predictions were wrong, that revenues are—or “receipts” is the proper term. Receipts are up. These 6 months with tax reform compared to the 6 months where we didn’t have tax reform, we are taking in more money.

Will we ever get an apology from all those who predicted doom and gloom? Of course not. But could we just have a little bit of joy that they were wrong, that the math is good, that good things are happening in this society?

We need to do more of it because, without the growth, there is no way we will keep our promises on Social Security and Medicare and so many other things. We must have economic growth.

This slide right here I am going to leave here for just a second, this slide here, 2017. We don’t use, really, the 2018 fiscal year because the first 6 months had part of it within tax reform, without tax reform. But then the gray you see up here is the 2019 first 6 months. That is what that is.

I know I get teased a lot about the slides, but at some point, if you are talking about math—and substantially, for all of us who are Members here, we work in a math-free zone. It is a sin of both parties because we often try to make public policy by our feelings instead of by our facts.

When we do public policy by feelings, I will make the argument that we hurt people because we intended good stuff, but we just got our facts wrong. Could you imagine if we did more like this where we looked at the real math and the real facts?

This is a month-to-month comparison. It shows you some months it has been a little more, some months it has been a little less. But, overall, \$10 billion over 2017. The first 6 months, when you compare them, it is working. It is working.

When you start to look at the revenues that are coming in, in what we call FICA taxes—Social Security, unemployment, Medicare—good things are happening.

You saw it 10 days ago when the Social Security actuaries put out their report. You saw things like Social Security disability go from being incredibly fragile, within just a couple of years of running out of money, to gaining 20 years of actuarial life. Some of

that was public policy. Some of that is the fact that people are working.

You see other parts of the program gaining a year’s worth of life. That is a big deal when you consider the types of numbers we are talking about. It is working. The growth is providing us, as a body, an opportunity to do positive things for our community, for our country, for our States. Instead, we just seem to banter around here, doing crazy.

Let’s walk around a couple of other things. Do you remember the predictions? This was the long-term, freaky-smart economists, particularly on the left but even some of ours on the right, who were predicting before tax reform that the baseline economic growth on the horizon was about 1.9, 1.8. That is where we were going to grow. Also, the math that, over the 10 years, if you wanted to pay for tax reform, we only needed a 0.4 percent growth.

Well, guess what? If you look at this chart and realize, since tax reform, what has happened in the GDP expansion, we are blowing through those numbers.

Now, it is too early to ever make a prediction like, well, the additional productivity, the additional number of folks working, the less demand on social entitlements because there is work, the number of Americans who now have healthcare because they are working and all these good things that are happening in our society.

But the fact of the matter is, if you look at this chart and look at the growth in the size of our economy—and this is a big economy, so when it grows 3 percent, it is a tremendous amount of economic expansion—we are seeing numbers that, once again, these really smart economists were telling us we could not hit.

Where is the joy around here? Whether you are on the left or the right, if you care about people, if you claim you truly love and care about people, the fact is that so many of them have work now and their wages are going up, particularly for our brothers and sisters who are—sorry to use the geeky term—at the lowest quartiles.

Do you remember the discussions only a couple of years ago that, if someone hadn’t finished high school, they were destined to spend their lives on the edge of poverty?

What have we seen in the last dozen months? That that is the quartile having the fastest movement in their wages.

There should be joy that something is breaking out, that something is happening out there when you see another 400,000 manufacturing jobs coming back to the United States.

Remember “manufacturing is dead”? Except it isn’t. We did tax policy that encouraged investment in plants and equipment to raise productivity.

Why is that so important? When someone gets a wage increase, when you pay an American more money,

what is the classic economic formula? It is inflation plus an improvement in productivity. Wages go up according to inflation and productivity.

What happens when American businesses, particularly in the manufacturing side, across the country are buying new plants and equipment because of the incentives in tax reform? All of a sudden, we are starting to see it is working. Spiking of productivity is happening.

We have a labor shortage. Wages are going up. Shouldn’t there be joy that the brothers and sisters out there who were being written off by the really smart economists just a couple of years ago are back and good things are happening?

To be a little bit gratuitous, I know these are hard to read, but if you just look at the trend lines on the employment chart and think about some of the other different quartiles, when we geek out on the Joint Economic Committee, and those of our brothers and sisters who are Hispanic or African American or females or other quartiles, where we try to break down and see what is happening in employment statistics, we are hitting numbers that we have never hit before in our society. Something is working.

□ 1600

How much happy talk have you heard around here? In many ways, is it just the nature of this institution is just the rage-based politics that we bathe in today? There are good things happening. We should be working on public policy to make more of this happen and more of this so this continues, so we are a society of opportunity.

So this one is just sort of looking at—I want to double-check myself. This one I put up just because it was a fascinating breakout, and this was actually more from last December and then looking at what is happening.

We had actually been having something called a labor force participation issue. It is sort of a geeky way of saying, for a society to grow, you often need two components.

You need capital stock. You need money that people can borrow to invest and to plant in equipment. Well, it turns out the predictions that were happening about tax reform, that capital stock was going to dry up, that everyone was going to go out and spend the money and this and that, it turns out savings, we have plenty of capital. Savings rates went up.

The second part was labor supply, and that one we have; we have a real issue. What do you do to encourage Americans who are not in the labor pool to enter it?

Then last December, we had this unusual thing. All of a sudden, the numbers within what we call millennials, millennial females started entering the labor force, and all of a sudden, we went over the 60—what? We had 62 or, I think, 62.3 percent labor force participation—I am doing it from memory—a

number that lots of those smart economists just a couple years ago told us we were not going to see again for another 30 years. It has happened.

Maybe it is time we as a body have an honest conversation that a lot of the economists who have been advising us are wrong, and the spirit of entrepreneurship, of capitalism, those things are actually working in our society and providing real benefits.

Look, as a guy coming to the microphone with lots of charts, but the math is the math. Even though we work in a math-free zone on occasion, there are really good numbers in this.

So I want to actually sort of touch on something else as we look at our pillars of the future of economic growth in our society.

You have heard discussions of the Green New Deal or environmental protection as almost a Malthusian concept that the economy must shrink to meet these numbers. We want to argue that is absolutely wrong.

The basic math set: Why has the United States done so phenomenally well in removing ACO₂, a man-made CO₂, from the environment? It is because of our migration to natural gas. We have gotten dramatically more clean, efficient in our energy production in the last decade, decade and a half because of natural gas.

Well, in that case we should produce more natural gas, right? It is working. But there are actually other disruptions of technology, and we are just going to throw a couple of them up just for the thought experiment, to understand.

If this were, once again, a couple years ago, the concept of pulling CO₂ out of the air was almost considered absurd—except for the fact it is happening. It is actually in Canada, but there is actually a facility that is going to be going online to almost, say, what you would call an industrial scale that will pull CO₂ out of the air incredibly efficiently.

It is a crazy concept, just crazy, except it works. The technology is out there.

How many of us, as we are debating meeting the Paris accord numbers, are saying here are actually things we can do to get us to the Paris accord commitments, which we are going to come really close. If we would adopt certain technologies, we get there.

I am going to ask you to reverse some of those slides so we actually talk about the nuclear power first. No, that is carbon capture. Yes.

Sorry. We were running late, so we ran up here with the boards.

This is just a quick thought experiment for folks to understand for clean power generation, and this is a couple years old. I think this slide is based on 2015 numbers.

Do you see the yellow side? That is all the solar that was new generation capacity in the entire country in 2015.

The other side, the multicolored over here, was the amount of absolutely

clean nuclear power generation that went off-line. So even though 2015 was a remarkable year of new, clean solar generation, we actually didn't really gain that much because clean nuclear power generation went off-line.

So this is the occasion of it is great to be joyful about one, but you need to make sure you have your math understanding what is going on.

Now, for us in Arizona, there is often this debate, the discussion of uranium. I don't want to geek out too much, but over the last 15 years or so, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and world energy markets on the nuclear side, there was high-grade uranium, almost weapons-grade, that was being stepped down to go into reactors. Most of that now has been used up.

So, actually, that slide. This is carbon capture. So what would happen to you if I came to you today and said it looks like our national labs have actually had a technology breakthrough that is stunning?

So, instead of us who are not too far from the Grand Canyon where we do the drilling to pull uranium out of the ground, which is always controversial because you worry about water supplies, but we need the uranium for all sorts of things in our society, what happens if there is never another land uranium mine again? Because we worked out the technology to pull uranium out of seawater. It has happened. It has happened.

Where is the joy around this place that technology is breaking through and providing us this sort of clean energy future in things that were just sort of academic fantasies just a few years ago and the technology is breaking through? This is wonderful. It is exciting, and there should be joy on all sides.

So let's actually go to this next one, and I am sorry for bouncing you back and forth.

Outside Houston is an experimental natural gas generation facility. It doesn't have a smokestack. It basically actually uses the CO₂ to spin the turbines. No smokestack. They capture every bit of the CO₂, and they are actually apparently going to go from, I think it is—forgive me if I got my math wrong—30 megawatts to 300. They are going to go to an industrial- or utility-grade scale.

But the fact of the matter is they are generating power without a smokestack, and they capture every bit of the CO₂ and can sell it, convert it into other products. We have the technology. It is up and running right now. They worked it out.

This should be joyful. If you want to actually have a bright powered future that provides the energy for the economy so the economy grows so we can keep our financial commitments but we want to protect the environment, we need to be talking about how we are going to bring more of this type of technology into our communities instead of sort of the Malthusian cra-

ziness of things that are in things like the Green New Deal, where we are going shut down this, shut down that, shut down this. There is a progrowth way to get there.

Those of us on the Ways and Means Committee even a year ago, Republicans and Democrats, we actually passed some more tax credit incentives for when you produce the CO₂, where do you put it? Well, you actually can get a little bit of credit if you put it in plastic or cement or put it in the curb that is being put into your neighborhood or actually put it into the ground to do recovery to bring up more hydrocarbons.

It is actually just really exciting, and the technology is working. We need to be talking about technology and its future and the disruption it is bringing and the bright, cleaner future environment it brings with it.

I brought this slide up because it is part of the thought experiment on this theme. Who here is concerned about plastic in the ocean? I mean, look, the Speaker is a good guy. He understands. I was a big scuba diver before I got this job. Now there is never time.

Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers, 8 of them in Southeast Asia, 2 in Africa. It is not the straw that you are going to not be allowed to use here in D.C. It is not the plastics in the United States. It is that 10 rivers bring 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean.

If we actually cared about plastic in the ocean, wouldn't we actually take our foreign aid, our environmental aid, our technology aid and say: "We know where the plastic in the ocean is coming from. Let's go help those 10 rivers, 8 of them in Asia, 2 in Africa. Let's help them get cleaner?"

That is Republican, Democrat, we want clean oceans. If you care about the plastic issue, doing crazy things like: "Well, I am going to actually affirm that I am a good person and I care by banning straws in my community even though it will have absolutely zero effect of making the oceans cleaner"—because, in the United States, our plastic substantially does not end up in the ocean. Let's stop the theater and do things that actually provide solutions.

This one just drives me insane because I care a lot about it. And it could be from the Foreign Affairs Committee to Natural Resources to Energy and Commerce, they should all say: "Hey, what do we do to help other countries not pump plastic into our oceans from those 10 rivers?" And if you did that, instantly, you just stopped 90 percent of the plastic waste going into the ocean.

That is a solution, but that is actually using—what is that crazy thing? Oh, yes—math to do public policy instead of feelings. But instead, around here, we get rewarded for doing theatrics.

Now, the next board we are going to put up is the great thought experiment, and this one actually is the ultimate disruption that I think may even happen in my lifetime, and I may lack some of the elegance or eloquence—excuse me—on how to describe it.

You all remember your high school or college botany biology class. You know, a plant cell from a couple million years ago, it has a certain issue of it wants to grow and it grabs an oxygen cell when it meant to grab a carbon molecule. Sorry. And then it spends lots of energy purging that one because “I don’t want the oxygen molecule; I want the carbon molecule to grow.”

Okay, I don’t mean to geek out, but it is a big deal. It is an inherent inefficiency in our plants that is a couple million years old.

It turns out, United States Government and a couple of university labs may have broken the code on the Holy Grail of plant biology, and with a tweak in the genetic code, a 40 percent improvement in growth.

Do the thought experiment with me. What happens tomorrow if, on the same piece of land you are growing soybeans or corn or cotton or grass in your yard, you have a 40 percent improvement in efficiency? How much less water are you using? How much

less fertilizer are you using? How much less fuel? How much less land?

It also means, mathematically, you also feed the world for the next couple hundred years.

World agriculture, if you wanted to do part of the thought experiment, world agriculture produces 2.2 times the amount of greenhouse gasses as every car on Earth. Think about that. So world agriculture, the math is you produce about 2.2 times more greenhouse gasses than every car on Earth. The adoption of this genetic change in our agriculture around the world would be as if you removed every single car off the face of the Earth. That is a disruption.

Now, it is going to also have implications on what agricultural land is worth. I mean, it will have a huge disruption across the world. But if you truly claim you care about the environment, and someone like me who does taxes and financial and economic growth as their specialty here in Congress reads articles like this and sees the disruption in the future for the environment, why isn’t this the discussion here?

If this is real, and we all know in seed stock, you can roll it out in just a few years. What would happen if in just a few years, it would be like you re-

moved every single car off the face of the Earth? That is what something like this equals.

We should be joyful here. We live in a time where technology is moving so fast it is presenting us solutions, and we need to stop the debates around this place that sound like we are all still in the 1990s.

The solutions are all around us, they are rolling out of our labs, they are rolling out of actually people’s garages. Smart people all around us and around the world are producing the solutions. We need to embrace and move those forward, or we can do what we are doing here so far this year, and that is engage in the political theater of rage and completely avoid the optimism of the solutions that are at our doorstep.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o’clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY AND BELGIUM, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 19, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Eliot Engel	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Stephen Lynch	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Jackie Speier	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. William Keating	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Gerry Connolly	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Hon. Filemon Vela	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Brian Monahan	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Paul Irving	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Wyndee Parker	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Kate Knudson Wolters	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Emily Berret	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Henry Connelly	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Jason Steinbaum	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Tim Bergreen	2/15	2/17	Germany		1,216.73		(3)				1,216.73
Daniel Silverberg	2/15	2/18	Germany		1,313.73		2,018.83				3,332.56
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. Eliot Engel	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. Adam Schiff	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. Stephen Lynch	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. Jackie Speier	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. William Keating	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Hon. Katie Hill	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Dr. Brian Monahan	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Paul Irving	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Wyndee Parker	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Emily Berret	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Henry Connelly	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Jason Steinbaum	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Tim Bergreen	2/17	2/19	Belgium		792.95		(3)				792.95
Committee total					33,892.39		2,018.83				35,911.22

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Donna Shalala	03/08	03/10	Colombia				822.60		474.00		1,296.60
Hon. James P. McGovern	03/28	03/31	Cuba		333.00		806.63		436.23		1,575.86
Don Sisson	03/28	03/31	Cuba		333.00		772.63		436.23		1,541.86
Committee total					666.00		2,401.86		1,346.46		4,414.32

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN, April 3, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2019

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES
 Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, April 9, 2019.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

822. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Compliance Deadline for Closed-Circuit Escape Respirators and Clarification of Post-Approval Testing Standards for Closed-Circuit Escape Respirators [Docket No.: CDC-2018-0003; NIOSH-309] (RIN: 0920-AA66) [Docket No.: CDC-2018-0068; NIOSH-318] (RIN: 0920-AA67) received April 24, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

823. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Xterra Swim, Intracoastal Waterway; Myrtle Beach, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

824. A letter from the DAA for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to U.S. Navy Marine Structure Maintenance and Pile Replacement in Washington [Docket No.: 170919913-9271-02] (RIN: 0648-BH27) received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

825. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison/Regulatory Specialist, Office of Natural Resources, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Rates for Calendar Year 2019 [Docket No.: ONRR-2017-0003; DS63644200 DRT000000.CH7000 190D113RT] (RIN: 1012-AA24) received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31246; Amdt. No.: 545] received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

827. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule— Airworthiness Directives; HPH s. r.o. Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0202; Product Identifier 2018-CE-050-AD; Amendment 39-19597; AD 2019-04-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

828. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0205; Product Identifier 2019-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-19598; AD 2019-05-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

829. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0704; Product Identifier 2018-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-19601; AD 2019-06-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

830. A letter from the Management and Programs Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0735; Product Identifier 2018-NE-26-AD; Amendment 39-19599; AD 2019-06-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

831. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0634; Product Identifier 2018-

NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-19594; AD 2019-05-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

832. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0924; Product Identifier 2018-NE-34-AD; Amendment 39-19600; AD 2019-06-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

833. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1085; Product Identifier 2016-SW-094-AD; Amendment 39-19603; AD 2019-06-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

834. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0895; Product Identifier 2018-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-19609; AD 2019-06-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

835. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0210; Product Identifier 2019-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-19608; AD 2019-06-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

836. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums

and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31244; Amdt. No.: 3845] received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

837. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1085; Product Identifier 2016-SW-094-AD; Amendment 39-19603; AD 2019-06-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

838. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31245; Amdt. No.: 3846] received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

839. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1063; Product Identifier 2018-NM-160-AD; Amendment 39-19606; AD 2019-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

840. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0433; Product Identifier 2016-SW-078-AD; Amendment 39-19602; AD 2019-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

841. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0191; Product Identifier 2018-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-19610; AD 2019-06-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

842. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0190; Product Identifier 2018-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-19607; AD 2019-06-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

843. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Seats France Cabin Attendant Seats [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0839; Product Identifier 2017-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-19614; AD 2019-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

844. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Revenue Procedure 2018-52 (EPCRS) (Revenue Procedure 2019-19) received April 24, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

845. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Fringe Benefit Aircraft Valuation Formula (Revenue Ruling 2019-10) received April 24, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

846. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting The Department's Major final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2020 [CMS-9926-F] (RIN: 0938-AT37) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

847. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 116th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Reform, Small Business, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 986. A bill to provide that certain guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect (Rept. 116-44, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 986 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2396. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for the purposes for which the funds were collected and to ensure that funds credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used to support navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REED,

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to make changes to the implementation of the network for manufacturing innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. HECK, Mr. CASE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. HECK, Mr. CASE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 2399. A bill to provide for greater transparency in the HUD-VASH supported housing program for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 2400. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and 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 Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 2401. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2402. A bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sex or sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2403. A bill to require agencies to ensure that menstrual hygiene products are stocked in, and available free of charge in, restrooms in public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2404. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to

the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Financial 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. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KATKO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CASE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SIREN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2405. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2406. A bill to amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002 to make certain changes to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's commissioned officer corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2407. A bill to promote human rights for Palestinian children living under Israeli military occupation and require that United States funds do not support military detention, interrogation, abuse, or ill-treatment of Palestinian children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 2408. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to update and clarify the classification of and applicable payment methodology for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; 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 Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2410. A bill to provide for the sealing or expungement of records relating to Federal nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2411. A bill to prohibit the sale of tobacco products to individuals under the age of 21; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr.

WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BRADY, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2412. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on the designation of the Muslim Brotherhood as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself and Ms. SHALALA):

H.R. 2413. A bill to designate Nicaragua under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Nicaragua to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2414. A bill to amend the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. JAYAPAL (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2415. A bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide States applying for distracted driving grants an explanation of the eligibility decision with respect to such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand and improve health care services by health centers and the National Health Service Corps for individuals with a developmental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2418. A bill to add Ireland to the E-3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2419. A bill to provide for nuclear weapons abolition and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992, while ensuring environmental restoration and clean-energy conversion; 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms.

HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 2420. A bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and 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 Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 2421. A bill to ensure that certain incidents involving a covered employee that are reported to the title IX coordinator at an eligible institution of higher education have been reviewed by the president of the institution and not less than 1 additional member of the institution's board of trustees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow suit against the United States for injuries and deaths of members of the Armed Forces of the United States caused by improper medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 2423. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving women in the United States the right to vote; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require reporting to the Federal Election Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of offers by foreign nationals to make prohibited contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. YOUNG:

H.R. 2425. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to limit recovery for certain injuries incurred in shellfish aquaculture activities if a remedy is available; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing support for the designation of April 30 as "National

Adult Hepatitis B Vaccination Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NOR-
TON, Mr. CASE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr.
CISNEROS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. KHANNA,
Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 332. A resolution recognizing the accomplishments and the contributions of Vietnamese Americans; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NOR-
TON, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VELA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 333. A resolution promoting and supporting the goals and ideals of the Fair Housing Act and supporting the recognition of April 2019 as Fair Housing Month, which includes bringing attention to the discrimination faced by everyday Americans in the United States in housing and housing-related transactions on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, and religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. COLE, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BACON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. ESTES, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Res. 334. A resolution recognizing May 2, 2019, as the 31st anniversary of the National Day of Prayer established under the Act entitled "An Act to provide for setting aside the first Thursday in May as the date on which the National Day of Prayer is celebrated", approved May 5, 1988, which was signed by President Ronald Reagan on May 5, 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Ms. TLAI, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H. Res. 335. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of April as Arab Amer-

ican Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Arab Americans in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

35. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2005, urging the Congress of the United States to decline to designate the great bend of the Gila River and surrounding areas as a national monument; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

36. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2007, urging the Congress of the United States to act to prohibit federal agencies from recommending and identifying Arizona's public lands as wilderness areas without express congressional consent; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2396.

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 Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 2397.

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. PETERS:

H.R. 2398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2400.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 2401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . .";

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;" and

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. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 2405.

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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, 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.

Mr. CASE:

H.R. 2406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 2409.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 2411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 2412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Sec 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 2413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2415.

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. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 2416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 2418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

H.R. 2421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2422.

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. STEFANIK:

H.R. 2423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 2424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4; Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 which deals with interstate commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 33: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 35: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 64: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 95: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 141: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 231: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 307: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 336: Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 366: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 372: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 445: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 465: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 510: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 555: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 586: Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 611: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 612: Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 649: Mr. HECK and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 662: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 663: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 665: Mr. POCAN and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 668: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 669: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 838: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 849: Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. HECK, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 888: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 919: Ms. HAALAND and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 925: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 935: Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. WEXTON, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 959: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 965: Mr. JORDAN, Ms. WILD, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1004: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1025: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1041: Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 1042: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1049: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1058: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1069: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1111: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1121: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1134: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1140: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GOMEZ, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1175: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1220: Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1241: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1243: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1274: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1345: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1358: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1366: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1377: Mr. RYAN and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1379: Mr. GOODEN, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1380: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1395: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1400: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1406: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1411: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1421: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1450: Mr. CASE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1456: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1458: Mrs. CRAIG and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1485: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1507: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1517: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1520: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1529: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1530: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1551: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1554: Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1570: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1588: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1595: Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 1605: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1629: Mr. BYRNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1630: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1646: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 1648: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1649: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1652: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1669: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1679: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1692: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 1694: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 1695: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1707: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1709: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1716: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1721: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1739: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1753: Mr. SPANO and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1754: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1773: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1779: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 1785: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1786: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1802: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1824: Mr. CLAY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. WILD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1830: Mr. CASE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 1835: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. LUETKE-MEYER.

H.R. 1857: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1858: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. COLE, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1865: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 1869: Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 1872: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1873: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1876: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1880: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 1895: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1914: Mr. BURCHETT.
 H.R. 1921: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
 H.R. 1923: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 1981: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1982: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1994: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. VELA, and Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 2006: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 2010: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 2050: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 2052: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2069: Mr. CASE, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 2075: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 2090: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2091: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 2108: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 2117: Mr. MCHENRY and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 2134: Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 2135: Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 2147: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 2148: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2153: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2156: Mr. RYAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. TONKO, Mr.

BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 2163: Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 2206: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 2207: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 2210: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 2214: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WEXTON, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2231: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H.R. 2235: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HECK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 2261: Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 2275: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 2288: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 2316: Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 2328: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 2331: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 2334: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 2336: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 2351: Mr. PETERS and Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 2367: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 2368: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2370: Mr. SIRES, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 2374: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2375: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2379: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 2386: Mr. FLORES.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mrs. TRAHAN.
 H.J. Res. 20: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.J. Res. 36: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. STANTON.
 H.J. Res. 52: Mr. ROUZER.

H. Con. Res. 34: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 45: Mr. WATKINS.
 H. Res. 129: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. TRONE.
 H. Res. 141: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H. Res. 179: Mr. COLE and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. HECK.
 H. Res. 189: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H. Res. 213: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. EVANS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. MOULTON.
 H. Res. 246: Mr. HOYER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H. Res. 259: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 261: Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H. Res. 285: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H. Res. 291: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. KIM, and Mr. CISNEROS.
 H. Res. 304: Mr. BIGGS.
 H. Res. 319: Mr. PETERS.
 H. Res. 326: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H. Res. 328: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H. Res. 330: Mr. CRIST.

 PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

14. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA) so as to extend the law's protections to mature American citizens, regardless of an employer's potential impact—or complete lack thereof—upon interstate commerce, and expanding applicability of ADEA to State and local units of government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.