



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2019

No. 81

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 15, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA E. SHALALA 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.

SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES IS AT RISK

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And still I rise because there is a crisis that has to be addressed.

Madam Speaker, the system of checks and balances that we have instilled within our government, a system that the Framers of the Constitution devised such that there would not be a concentration of power in the

hands of the chief executive officer of the government, in fact, is to prevent a concentration of power in any aspect. There is power that is spread across the government.

There are three branches of the government. I want to focus this morning, if I may, on two—the executive and the legislative—because, Madam Speaker, this morning, as I stand before you, a proud American, I must inform all that the system of checks and balances is at risk.

It is at risk because we now have a President who does not believe that he can or will be impeached. We have a President who refuses to allow Congress to perform its constitutionally accorded oversight responsibilities.

When you have a President who does this, Madam Speaker, you lose the power of Congress. It becomes concentrated in the President. The Presidency becomes a place where power is concentrated because the President has no fear:

He doesn't believe that there are consequences for his going beyond what the Constitution allows;

He will engage in conduct that Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution would prohibit; and

He will engage in impeachable offenses because he knows that the Congress will not impeach him.

It is impeachment that is the ultimate guard against a reckless, ruthless, lawless President; and if we do not exert our authority, this President, knowing that we won't, is capable of doing things that we cannot imagine.

Madam Speaker, it is up to us, the Members of this Congress, to assure that this government continues to have the checks and balances that the Framers of the Constitution intended. If we do not, if Congress does not fulfill its responsibility, we won't have a Presidency. The power will be so concentrated that we will have a monarchy.

The Framers of the Constitution never intended for a President to just totally disregard the Congress. And notwithstanding all that might happen in the courts, notwithstanding all of the subpoenas that may be taken to court and have them litigated properly, the ultimate check on a President is Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution, and that is impeachment when he commits impeachable acts.

We have the Mueller report. It speaks for itself. And there are many constitutional scholars who have said there has been an obstruction to take place.

There are many lawyers who have worked in the Justice Department. They number hundreds now, the lawyers who have signed on, indicating that the President should be beneath the law just as everyone else is, or the law should apply to him. He shouldn't be above the law.

They are indicating that, if we don't act, we are showing the President that he is above the law. He then becomes a monarch, and we then become a weaker form of government.

So I call upon this Congress: Let us do what is expected of us. The Framers of the Constitution gave us the way. They have shown the way. We but only have to have the will, and it is worth it for us to do this because the country is at stake in the sense that the government is at risk.

Madam Speaker, I love my country.

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

RECOGNIZING LIONS CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak

□ 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.

H3795

about an organization that is near and dear to my heart: the Lions Clubs International.

I am a member of my hometown organization, the Howard Area Lions Club. The Howard Area Lions Club has consistently earned the recognition as the largest Lions Club in Pennsylvania.

There are probably many factors that have led them to this, but none more significant than their commitment to the Lions Club motto, "We Serve."

The members of my club served as the chartering organization for the Howard Boy Scout Troop 353; and, in the past, I was proud to serve as Scoutmaster of that unit.

Simply put, service is of the utmost importance to the Lions. The clubs are places where individuals can join together to give their valuable time and effort to improving their communities and the world.

Where there is a need, there is a Lion. There are 1.4 million Lions around the world, 47,000 Lions Clubs in more than 200 countries. For more than 100 years, Lions have been serving humanity.

The idea of the Lions Club began in 1917. A 38-year-old Chicago business leader named Melvin Jones told members of his local business club that they should reach beyond business issues and address the betterment of their communities and the world. They agreed.

Three years later, Lions Clubs became an international organization. Melvin Jones inspired generations of people to become civic-minded individuals, dedicated to using their talents and ambitions to improve their communities without financial reward.

Melvin Jones had a personal code: "You can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else."

Madam Speaker, service to others is what makes the Lions Clubs International such a powerful force for good in the world.

There are nearly 70 Members of Congress who are involved in service organizations, and that is why I am proud to be working with my colleague Congressman JIMMY PANETTA to establish the Congressional Service Organization Caucus. We plan to launch the caucus soon.

It will support the many operations that are dedicated to giving back to their communities. I encourage my colleagues to join because there are few gifts greater than the gift of time and service to others.

Madam Speaker, Lions Clubs International is on Capitol Hill today to raise awareness about how helpful service organizations are to communities across the Nation.

I am grateful that Lions Clubs around the globe serve millions annually, and I am so proud to be a member of an organization that not only lives up to its remarkable ideals but exceeds them time and time again.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I recently introduced the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, which will continue the important work of the original bill and expand its critical programs to improve infant health across the United States. Every year, thousands of babies are born with genetic, metabolic, hormonal, and functional conditions that severely affect their development.

Fifty years ago, these rare disorders in infants would have gone undetected until symptoms appeared, often too late to provide them with the essential treatment needed to prevent lifelong disability or even death. Today, we can give newborn babies a simple blood test that can identify such life-threatening genetic illnesses before symptoms appear.

In 2008, Congress passed my original bill, which was a major step toward establishing newborn screening guidelines across the United States. Until that time, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required newborn screening for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on these diseases. Today, 49 States and the District of Columbia screen for at least 31 of the 35 currently recommended core conditions.

Each year, with newborn screening, healthcare professionals identify approximately 12,000 babies who test positive for one of these rare conditions. This invaluable early detection allows for timely treatment to prevent long-term damage and severe health complications, which gives babies the opportunity to live relatively normal and healthy lives.

For thousands of mothers and families, this early and simple intervention can also reduce the emotional stress of trying to identify their baby's correct diagnosis.

Investments in newborn screening can also save up to \$1 million over a child's lifetime. This is a significant savings for American families and our financially burdened healthcare system.

While it is true that since the original passage of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, significant advancements have been made in early detection and treatment, serious gaps in newborn screening remain. The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will build on the current newborn screening infrastructure and strengthen early detection of preventable disease.

To ensure the quality of laboratories involved in newborn screening, the bill reauthorizes the Centers for Disease Control grants, and it continues HRSA grants to empower parents and health professionals with education and resources to improve newborn screening.

The bill also renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children, which maintains and updates the recommended uniform screening panel that States adopt and implement.

The bill funds research to identify new screening technologies and treatments, and a new provision in the bill commissions the National Academy of Medicine to issue recommendations to modernize newborn screening systems into the 21st century.

The Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will continue to ensure that parents and health providers are knowledgeable about the value of newborn screening, and it will help ensure that infants across the United States receive comprehensive and consistent testing.

A coalition of public health groups, including the March of Dimes, the Association of Public Health Laboratories, the American College of Medical Genetics, and the National Organization for Rare Disorders, support the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act. Their leadership has been critical to advance newborn screening across the United States.

Madam Speaker, newborn screening is one of the most important public health interventions of the 20th century. It is critical that, in the 21st century, we continue and strengthen the programs and research of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act.

I urge my colleagues to sponsor the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act to enhance the lives of hundreds of infants and families each year in the United States.

RECOGNIZING ZANE MOORE OF THE BUCKS COUNTY YMCA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual and organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, working to make our community a better place.

Earlier this month, Zane Moore, the president and CEO of the YMCA of Bucks County, walked across the entire county to raise awareness of the positive impact the YMCA has on our neighbors and funding for its programs.

Last Thursday, Zane began his trek at the YMCA in Quakertown, wrapping up at the YMCA in Doylestown. He picked up on Friday where he left off, completing his journey that same day, all the way to the YMCA in Lower Bucks County in Fairless Hills.

Madam Speaker, I applaud Zane and all the local leaders who joined him along the way on his journey. We appreciate the work of the YMCA and all of its efforts to promote education, physical well-being, and recovery programs for those in our community.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING ROTARIAN OF THE YEAR MAX ROSE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who was recently honored as Rotarian of the Year by the Rotary Club of Doylestown.

Last month, 24-year Rotary Club member Max Rose received this distinction at the 10th annual Four-Way Test Awards Fundraiser. During his distinguished tenure, he twice served as president of the Rotary Club of Doylestown, has been an instrumental force in the organization's youth exchange program, and has assisted greatly in local events such as the Borough Dam cleanup and the Doylestown at Dusk Car Show.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Max on this well-deserved recognition. I also thank Rotary Club president Gail Linenberg, along with all the members of the Rotary Club of Doylestown, for their dedication and their service to our community.

RECOGNIZING STUDENTS AND FACULTY OF ST. ANDREW SCHOOL, NEWTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of students in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently partnered with a local organization to comfort children who have experienced traumatic events.

At St. Andrew School in Newtown, a group of third-grade students participated in a service project in collaboration with the Newtown Quilters' Guild. Using lighthearted drawings by the students, the guild will create colorful quilts and distribute them to the Newtown Township Police Department and emergency services personnel to give to young children who have been through difficult situations.

Madam Speaker, I applaud these students and the faculty of St. Andrew School in Newtown, especially Principal Nancy Matteo and third-grade teachers Ashlyn Kalicki and Lynn Dixon.

I also thank all the members of the Newtown Quilters' Guild for their thoughtfulness, along with all the officers of the Newtown Township Police Department on this National Police Week. We appreciate all the work they do for our community.

CELEBRATING 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support and celebration of the 54th anniversary of the Head Start program and the 25th anniversary of the Early Head Start program.

As a former Head Start teacher, I know how vital the program is to over 100,000 low-income children in California and the more than 1 million families across the country who rely on its essential services.

I began my journey at Head Start as an assistant teacher and later became the supervisor of parent involvement and volunteer services, helping parents participate and contribute to their children's educational experiences.

Head Start services include health screenings, nutritional education, and social support for families with children in the program. Early Head Start provides services like home visits to children at birth. Head Start even funds research and functions as a laboratory for early learning innovation.

From the moment I became involved with Head Start, I saw the potential it had to empower and uplift children and their families. Since then, I have worked hard to improve and expand Head Start so that this potential is realized and more families have an opportunity for a better life.

My role as supervisor of parent involvement and volunteer services provided me with insights into the unique and pivotal role parents play in the Head Start community.

I am so appreciative of the Head Start and Early Head Start programs in my home district in California. These programs basically provide resources and referral services, and research innovative new programs in the areas of childcare, development, and family well-being.

These programs serve tens of thousands of low-income children and their families, usually in communities like South Los Angeles, Gardena, Hawthorne, Inglewood, and Lawndale, and demonstrate Head Start's transformative potential.

I will continue to strengthen Congress' relationship with Head Start and parents and encourage more Members and families to become involved.

Since President Johnson first announced Head Start in the spring of 1965, the program and its services have reached over 32 million children. Study after study shows that providing early childhood education to children is transformative to their future academic success.

Children who joined Head Start graduated high school and attended college at higher rates than their siblings who did not participate in the program. Head Start participants consistently show substantial improvements on test scores early in life. Adults who participated in Head Start in their youth are less likely to be charged with a crime or become a teenage parent.

These programs are so much more than federally funded preschool programs for the youngest Americans. They are a lifeline for vulnerable communities and provide future generations a chance to succeed.

This critical program is our national pledge that every child, regardless of circumstances at birth, has an opportunity to achieve and excel in school and in life. There is perhaps no greater purpose for an elected official than working toward the realization of that pledge. I will never stop.

In addition to my support here in making sure that the funding continues and that it grows, I also focus on the oversight, supervision, and management of Head Start programs.

In the greater Los Angeles community, many of our delegate agencies are overseen by LACOE. This is a county organization.

I want LACOE to get more involved in keeping Head Start programs rather than shutting them down. I believe there must be a strong component that works with compliance and works with training to make sure that the programs meet all the requirements because our teachers, our assistant teachers, and our volunteers are doing the very best job they can do. Many of them need that kind of support. I am not so sure they are getting all of it, but I am going to pay even more attention to LACOE in the greater Los Angeles area to ensure that they are providing the kinds of services that strengthen Head Start programs and do the kind of outreach in the communities to make sure that our families know the availability of the Head Start programs.

I believe that Head Start has been one of the most significant programs of the overall poverty program, and I am one of its greatest supporters.

THIS HOUSE IS NOT IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, this Chamber is going in the wrong direction in the effort to combat the BDS movement, to combat anti-Israel hate, to combat anti-Semitism.

I went through kindergarten through 12th grade, college, law school, 4 years of Active Duty. I never once experienced anti-Semitism. But now I hear countless stories all across our country and college campuses today. It is infiltrating American politics, college campuses, and the Halls of Congress.

We need to do something about it, not just send a strong message, which is important, but actually pass something with teeth to do something about it.

One of my colleagues from Michigan gave a talk last Friday, gave an interview. She was asked about her support for a one-state solution that would remove Jews from power in their own country, in Israel. Her response was that the Holocaust gives her a calming feeling because of the safe haven that the Palestinians provided to Jews.

Now, that happens to be the opposite of factually accurate. But then, if you have any problem with those words, that makes you automatically an Islamophobe and a racist idiot, according to the person who had said that.

Then the Speaker of the House is calling for us to come to the floor and apologize to Ms. TLAI.

Well, here I am. My apology is for everyone who is insulted across America

that we passed a watered-down, spineless resolution, after countless acts of anti-Semitism by another Member, that does not name names.

I apologize to everyone across this country expecting this House to act. We failed them.

The students at the University of California who had to read the posting: "Gas them, burn them, and dismantle their power structure. Humanity cannot progress with the parasitic Jew."

The founder of BDS was blatantly anti-Semitic. Take his own words: "No Palestinian—rational Palestinian, not a sellout Palestinian—will ever accept a Jewish state in Palestine."

Or this other quote: "We are witnessing the rapid demise of Zionism, and nothing can be done to save it, for Zionism is intent on killing itself. I, for one, support euthanasia."

Or we could take this quote: "Many of the methods of collective and individual 'punishment' meted out to Palestinian civilians at the hands of young, racist, often sadistic and ever impervious Israeli soldiers . . . are reminiscent of common Nazi practices against the Jews." This is the founder of the BDS movement.

You want an apology, Madam Speaker? Well, how about the students at Berkeley who sit in the classroom and the maps that go up on the board? Where it is supposed to say Israel, it says Palestine. Or the students in Michigan whose professor refused to sign off on a letter of recommendation because the student wanted to study abroad in Israel.

This past Thursday, we had an imam give the opening prayer here before this Chamber. This imam—a simple Google search, by the way, in the vetting would have come up with the background, and it is a long list—is not just a supporter of the BDS movement but has compared the Israelis to the Nazis, called the Israelis a terrorist regime, called for a third Palestinian intifada, and posted in support of the Muslim Brotherhood.

I mentioned earlier one of my colleagues who had multiple anti-Semitic postings. One started with: "Israel has hypnotized the world, may Allah awaken the people and help them see the evil doings of Israel"; or saying that if you support Israel, then you must have been bought off by Jews; or when she said if you support the U.S-Israel relationship, then you must have pledged your allegiance to a foreign power.

You want an apology, Madam Speaker? How about the students at Warren Wilson College who had a speaker tell them Jews are doing the same thing to the Palestinians as the Nazis did to the Jews?

Students from coast to coast all across this entire country are expecting, demanding, this House to act.

Now, you could go to the Twitter account of Ms. TLAI. You will see over the course of the last few days postings from Tamika Mallory and fellow organizer Linda Sarsour.

Tamika Mallory says that Louis Farrakhan is the "greatest of all time," Louis Farrakhan, the same guy who said: "So when they talk about Farrakhan, call me a hater, you do what they do, call me an anti-Semite. Stop it, I'm anti-Termite"; or, "Satanic Jews have infected the whole world with poison and deceit"; or what he said about Adolf Hitler of Nazi Germany, who was responsible for murdering 6 million Jewish people and millions of others, "He was a very great man."

We have Members of this Chamber who have associated themselves with Farrakhan, not just Tamika Mallory.

I mentioned Linda Sarsour. She said: "Only Jews . . . are the ones that condone violence against Arabs and are cool with mosques being attacked."

We have an issue in this Chamber, and we need to do something about it, not mask it, not empower it, not elevate it. It must be identified and crushed.

And no, Madam Speaker, I am not coming to this floor and apologizing to my colleagues who push it. I will apologize to everyone across this country offended by the lack of action by the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, your House is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF R. NORMAN FRANCK

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to mourn the passing of Norman Franck, a fire police officer and member of the Willow Street Fire Company.

After responding to a crash this past weekend, Norman fell ill and then passed away at Lancaster General Hospital. It was a tremendous loss to our community and, certainly, even more so to his wife, Marian.

Today, we remember her in our thoughts and prayers and wish her comfort and peace in this time of mourning.

□ 1030

Norman will be remembered as a giving man, described by Willow Street Fire Company Chief Craig Rhineer as someone who would do anything for you. Norman, by the way, was also considered an authority on the history of the Willow Street Fire Company.

He lived a life in service to the community, as a member of the fire service and ambulance company since the 1980s. When he moved to Maryland, he served there at the St. Michael's Volunteer Fire Company. Then, after returning to Lancaster County, he resumed his service once again at the Willow Street Fire Company.

Even at age 81, Norman still selflessly served his community. His spirit of volunteerism, his spirit of giving, should be an example for us all.

We thank him for his years of service.

Madam Speaker, I ask everyone to join me in keeping his family and the members of Willow Street Fire Company in our prayers.

Madam Speaker, members of our volunteer fire companies are true heroes. Today, we honor Norman Franck, a hero who served in my community.

HOLD POLLUTERS ACCOUNTABLE FOR PFAS CONTAMINATION

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to shed light on PFAS contamination, a crisis affecting water systems that serve upward of 19 million people across our great country.

For decades, manufacturing companies have known that these chemicals are extremely hazardous to human health, have actively taken steps to bury unfavorable research, and have used false uncertainty to fight off regulations that could help ensure public safety.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2570, the PFAS User Fee Act, to hold chemical manufacturers financially accountable for their role in this contamination crisis. These manufacturers must take responsibility for their role in this crisis and contribute to the solution.

Congress must finally hold these polluters accountable for the harm they continue to cause. The safety of our water systems and the air we breathe is at stake.

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 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Church, Milner, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our most kind, gracious Heavenly Father, we come to You in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ. We lift this body up to You because You admonish us to pray for kings and for all who are in authority.

I, first and foremost, lift up their spiritual lives to You, realizing we are

a spirit that has a soul, housed in a body. May each Member have spiritual peace.

I also pray for each Member relationally. The Scripture admonishes for leaders to lead a peaceable life. May the blessing of peace rest on their homes.

Lastly, I pray for them physically. Would You grant strength, health, and wisdom to each one. Lord, may every Member realize You have placed them here and acknowledge their ultimate accountability is to You.

Lord, I thank You for this great opportunity, and I pray this prayer in the name above every name, the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO 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 DR. BENNY TATE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Benny Tate, whose leadership and guidance have made him an incredibly valuable member of his community in Milner, Georgia, and our Third District.

Dr. Tate has been the senior pastor of Rock Springs Church in Milner for over 25 years. In that time, when it started as a church of just 60, it has now grown to a church of over 6,000.

Through this work, Dr. Tate has also shepherded the creation of several ministries, including the Rock Springs Medical Clinic, the Rock Springs Christian Academy, the Potter's House for Women, and Impact Christian Ministries for the homeless.

Benny has been married to his wife, Barbara, for over 30 years, and they have one daughter, Savannah Abigail, who is here with him today.

I want to commend Dr. Tate for his commitment to our community. There is not a week that goes by where he isn't a welcoming part of the Third District of Georgia.

The grace and love he has shown to his parishioners and neighbors throughout his 25 years in Milner is un-

paralleled, and I am truly honored to have Dr. Benny Tate here with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WE THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, "We the People" is a bold opening statement enshrined in our Constitution. Yet, the truth is that in most parts of our country, LGBTQ Americans are not included in "We the People."

Students in Arizona should go to school free from fear and bullying. Workers in Texas should not be afraid of being fired because of who they are. Renters in Mississippi should not be evicted because of who they love.

No person, no matter where they live in America, should face discrimination. Equality should not depend on the ZIP Code where you live. It is time to make equality for LGBTQ people the law of the land and to ensure that we, too, are part of "We the People."

I urge my colleagues to be on the right side of history and to vote "yes" on the Equality Act.

UMITA WILL HELP STATE AND LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE RE- NEWAL

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as the national conversation revolves around infrastructure this week, I would like to highlight H.R. 300, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, or UMITA, which I introduced with my Democratic colleague, Representative CUELLAR.

UMITA will further our goal of renewing our country's infrastructure by making sure that overly burdensome Federal regulations don't hinder progress on State and local levels.

State and local governments shoulder the greatest cost of infrastructure projects, and any Federal legislation to assist their efforts must account for costs of regulatory compliance. Every dollar spent on compliance with burdensome mandates is less money for the projects States and localities need.

UMITA passed with a bipartisan vote in the last four Congresses, and I call for it to be included in any comprehensive infrastructure legislation considered in this body.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CLIMATE RESILIENCY and READINESS ACT

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, climate change is a major threat to our national security; and military leaders agree.

Last year, the Department of Defense studied 79 mission-critical bases and found that climate change threatened most of them. In the past year alone, three of our military installations suffered significant damage from natural disasters, and they are still not fully recovered.

It is clear that the scale of this challenge is great. That is why today I am introducing the Department of Defense Climate Resiliency and Readiness Act to help tackle this challenge.

By setting clear goals and ensuring regular dedicated resources, my bill gives military leaders the tools and flexibility to implement policies that work best for their missions. We will also ensure the DOD budgets for resiliency and maintains a focus on cutting-edge technologies like hybrid microgrids and additive manufacturing.

As one of the world's largest energy consumers, DOD can offer invaluable leadership toward addressing the global climate challenge, while bolstering U.S. national security; and that starts today.

WORK IN A BIPARTISAN WAY TO DEFEAT RUSSIAN ELECTION IN- TERFERENCE

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

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, by expanding American energy, expelling diplomats, and ensuring that the United States takes its position in the world, President Trump has been tougher on Russia than any President in a generation.

But the fact remains that the Russian military attacked the U.S. election. And so it would seem reasonable that, along with the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the CIA, we would want the United States military offering the full suite of capabilities, both offensive and defensive, to combat Russian election interference.

Today, the House Armed Services Committee held a classified briefing on the U.S. military and their participation in this critical mission. I was deeply disappointed in what I learned.

The U.S. military is not sufficiently engaged or informed on critical aspects of the Russian election interference campaign. They don't even know which two Florida counties were hacked.

And when DOD sent 11 people to go work with the Department of Homeland Security to have the full suite of

authorities available to respond to Russia, they were told they weren't needed.

Russia has a whole-of-government approach to this problem, and I would urge us to work in a bipartisan way in the Defense Authorization Act to ensure that we are ready with our full authorities to defeat Russia and their efforts to interfere with our election.

HIGHLIGHTING THE STRUGGLE OF RAIL COMMUTERS IN NEW JERSEY'S SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, today I rise to highlight the struggle that rail commuters in New Jersey's Seventh District face each day.

Public transportation is vital to my State, where twice as many of us depend on it than the national average.

Right now, though, the 23,000 people who rely on the main rail line that cuts through the heart of my district, the Raritan Valley Line, are the only commuters in northern New Jersey without one-seat ride access to Manhattan during peak hours. To get to New York, they must transfer to Newark, adding at least 25 minutes to their commutes.

Now, you might ask, why am I bringing this local issue to the House? Why can't New Jersey solve it by itself?

Well, I will tell you why. Because every rail passenger trying to get to work along this economic corridor that is so vital, not just to my State, but to the economy of the United States, must squeeze through a crumbling, 110-year old bottleneck of a tunnel under the Hudson River that is owned and operated by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government won't fix it.

The Raritan Valley Line Mayor's Alliance, representing over 30 mayors, has been working to get one-seat ride. We need to do our part by passing an infrastructure bill this year that will fund the Gateway tunnel.

HEALTHCARE PRICES

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Payment Commission Data Act, which would make prescription drug prices more transparent, and the BLOCKING Act, which would bring generic drugs to the market faster.

I also support the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act, which would prohibit drug companies from delaying the entry of generic drugs into the market.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, Democrats have packaged these bills together with poison pills that would

prevent States from offering lower cost healthcare plans.

Democrats want to increase ObamaCare enrollment regardless of cost, but ObamaCare is not affordable for many Americans. The average monthly premium for a family of four is over \$1,500, forcing Missourians to cut housing and child care so they can pay skyrocketing premiums. It is not a solution. We must take immediate action to allow States to promote choices and affordability.

BLUE WATER NAVY VETERANS

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 299, the Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act of 2019. This long overdue legislation would finally provide disability benefits to veterans who served in the territorial seas surrounding Vietnam during the Vietnam war and were exposed to Agent Orange.

This change is long overdue but, sadly, thousands of brave Vietnam veterans have already suffered the consequences of Agent Orange-related illnesses.

A longtime resident of Media, Pennsylvania, John Bury, was a 22-year veteran of the Navy and a legendary advocate for sailors sickened by Agent Orange. He, himself, survived cancer six times related to Agent Orange, and knew firsthand the challenges of navigating the VA due to his service being on ships, rather than land.

John passed away in late 2016, but his memory and service will live on. Sailors like John are heroes and deserve to be treated as such by the VA.

I urge the Senate to quickly take up this legislation and send it to the President's desk so that thousands of others like John can get the care they deserve.

□ 1215

NATIONAL DRUG COURT MONTH

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, May is National Drug Court Month, and I rise to recognize these remarkable facilities on their 30th anniversary. Since 1989, drug courts have provided countless addicted Americans referral to treatment and a lifesaving alternative to incarceration.

When I first started Operation UNITE in my district in 2003, there were only five drug courts in the whole district of 30 counties. Today, we have one in all 30 counties, and those volunteer judges are changing more lives than ever before.

At this moment, drug courts are providing a new lease on life to 144,000 Americans around the country. Thank you to the countless professionals who

make up our 3,000 drug courts. We have got a long road ahead, but I look forward to ensuring drug courts remain a central part of that journey.

GUN SHOPS SHOULD MEET MINIMUM SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, across our Nation, we face an epidemic. In schools, in churches, on our streets, Americans are dying from gun violence.

We have a moral responsibility to do everything in our power to prevent more people from suffering the loss of a loved one to the scourge of illegal guns. That is why I have introduced the Gun Theft Prevention Act.

Last year, more than 500 gun shops were burglarized nationwide, releasing thousands of deadly weapons onto our streets and into the hands of criminals. In my district, a single gun shop was broken into twice in the same week, seven times in the span of a decade.

Yet licensed gun dealers are not required to take even the most basic precautions, like locking their doors at night, to prevent these dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

My bill requires gun shops to meet minimum security requirements, like locked cabinets and video surveillance, creates strong enforcement mechanisms, requires reporting of stolen guns, and authorizes 650 new ATF inspectors.

This is commonsense legislation that will save lives, and I will work tirelessly to ensure its passage.

PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today is Peace Officers Memorial Day, when we pay tribute to local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers who serve and protect our communities.

Today is an extra special day for one of my constituents and his family: Sugarcreek Police Sergeant Anthony Gorman, who was shot April 4, 1997, while investigating a suspicious car in a parking lot in Franklin, Pennsylvania. He never fully recovered from his injuries.

In October of 2014, Sergeant Gorman died at the age of 72, more than 17 years after that initial gunshot. While his death was a direct consequence of the 1997 shooting, a doctor listed his cause of death as natural, which prevented him from being honored at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial here in Washington, D.C.

His son, Christopher, then embarked on a mission to have his dad's name

memorialized. After years of research, petitions, and advocacy, it is now engraved at the East Pathway of Remembrance at section 25, line 31.

Sergeant Gorman's family was here this week for the candlelight vigil held Monday on The Mall, and thanks to Christopher Gorman's determination, his dad's name is finally where he belongs.

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, May 15, 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 May 15, 2019, at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1231.

That the Senate passed S. 1436.

Appointment:

The Senate National Security Working Group.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, EQUALITY ACT; PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 312, MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIR- MATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 987, MARKETING AND OUTREACH RESTORATION TO EMPOWER HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee

Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 987) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 377, providing for consideration of H.R. 5 under a closed rule, with 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution also provides for consideration of H.R. 312 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Lastly, this resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 987 under a structured rule, with 90 minutes of general debate, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. Twenty-seven amendments are made in order.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for three important pieces of legislation: H.R. 987, H.R. 312, and H.R. 5.

H.R. 987 is the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act, a package of several bills, many of them bipartisan, that went through the House Energy and Commerce Committee under regular order. This bill combines three key bills to lower drug costs by promoting generic competition and four key bills to strengthen healthcare, reverse the sabotage of the ACA by this administration with respect to marketing and outreach, and rescind the Trump administration's efforts to promote junk plans that lack the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

The American people are justifiably demanding action by Congress to make prescription drugs more affordable. Prices are so high that recent data show 24 percent of Americans didn't fill a prescription in the past year due to high costs.

My constituents have been vocal in demanding action on drug pricing, patients like Bill, a senior with diabetes who attends my church, parents like Sarah with children who have special health needs. Folks like these need help now.

This package would lower costs by banning anticompetitive practices that large drug companies employ to keep generics off the market.

This bill will also tackle many of the reasons we have seen enrollment

through the Affordable Care Act decline in recent years.

Since coming into office, President Trump has cut paid advertising and outreach efforts for healthcare exchanges by 90 percent. This wanton political decision to cut these efforts is but one part of the administration's attempts to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, lack of transparency on the part of Health and Human Services around funding levels for outreach plan enrollment rates and other vital statistics has created an information vacuum on the performance of the ACA.

Greater transparency is required in order for Congress to hold the administration accountable for its efforts to defund education and outreach for the Affordable Care Act.

Second, we have H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This important bill recognizes and respects the Tribal sovereignty of the Mashpee Wampanoag, a Tribe that has inhabited New England for over 12,000 years and, in fact, welcomed the Pilgrims to the new world.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support in Massachusetts among other Tribal nations and with Tribal allies in Congress. Had President Trump not tweeted about this bill last week, it would have likely passed on suspension and been sent to the Senate for consideration. The members of this Tribe cannot wait any longer for recognition, and we need to pass this critical legislation without further delay.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this is a week that will be remembered in our history books because, at long last, this body is taking up consideration of the Equality Act. Forty-five years ago this week, the legendary Congresswoman Bella Abzug introduced the first version of the Equality Act, a bill that will give full legal protections to LGBTQ people all across our country.

This version of the Equality Act that we consider today is the result of years of careful legislative drafting and amends existing civil rights laws to provide protections from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in key areas of public life: employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service.

Additionally, the Equality Act updates the public spaces and services covered in current law to include retail stores, services such as banks, legal services, and transportation services. These important updates will strengthen existing protections for everyone.

The journey to this final version of the Equality Act was led by a man who is a history maker in his own right, co-chair of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE from Rhode Island.

□ 1230

Congressman CICILLINE worked with lawyers and advocates from the left

and the right, religious groups, and myriad civil rights groups to make sure that the language of the Equality Act achieved full legal equality while doing nothing to undermine existing civil rights protections for other marginalized groups.

The resulting bill is supported by 130 of the largest employers in the country, our largest labor unions, and hundreds of organizations, including, to name just a few, the Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the National Women's Law Center, the Episcopal Church, the Union for Reform Judaism, and the United Church of Christ.

Most importantly, it is supported by a clear and overwhelming majority of the American people. Seventy-one percent of Americans support legislation like the Equality Act to protect LGBTQ people against discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations.

Rarely does Congress have the chance to take up legislation so clearly supported by our constituents. That is probably why, since the day that Congressman CICILLINE first introduced this version of the Equality Act in 2015, it has always earned bipartisan support and currently has Republican cosponsors in both the House and the Senate.

The clear majority of both this Chamber and the American people recognize that, for far too long, LGBTQ people have faced discrimination with no Federal legal recourse. It is beyond dispute that LGBTQ people, especially transgender people and especially transgender women of color, face discrimination across this country.

This is a personal issue for me. It has been personal since my baby sister came out to me about 40 years ago.

For many people in this country, that is when the fight hits home. It gets personal when someone you love says, "This is who I am," and you know and value that person, and you will do whatever you can to make sure that your loved one can live life to the fullest, free from hate and discrimination.

I am sad to say that my home in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the 30 States that defies the will of its people by not having legal protections for LGBTQ people. The idea that my sister, someone who put her life on the line for our country when she served in the armed forces, could drive across State lines and lose protections is heartbreaking.

The Equality Act ends the patchwork of State laws and creates uniform nationwide protections. LGBTQ people won't have to worry that being transferred to another State by their employer or needing to move home to take care of ailing parents will cause them to lose civil rights protections. From sea to shining sea, LGBTQ people will have the security and stability that comes from knowing that if they face discrimination, they have legal recourse.

It is also important to note what the Equality Act does not do. The Equality Act does not impinge on religious liberty. Religious liberty is a cornerstone value of our Constitution and our country. Religious organizations are able to prefer their own members and their version of morality in hiring for religious positions such as ministers, rabbis, or schoolteachers. The Equality Act does nothing to change that.

The Equality Act clarifies what has long been held, though, that religious freedom laws do not create an exemption to civil rights laws. Just like a person can't use a claim of religious freedom to refuse to sell a house to an interracial couple, under the Equality Act, LGBTQ families will be protected from discrimination, regardless of its motivation.

Consider the stakes facing LGBTQ people too often across this country. A same-sex couple walks into a restaurant. They hired a babysitter to look after their young children and are hoping to have a relaxing night out. They are seated and looking at the menu when the manager comes over and tells them they have to leave. They are not welcome there.

This kind of insecurity and humiliation occurs on a daily basis across this country. In 30 States, the couple would have no legal recourse. Often, humiliation is just the tip of the iceberg.

Same-sex couples are far more likely to be denied housing. Qualified and high-performing transgender people are more likely to be fired from their jobs. LGBTQ young people face rejection, homelessness, and discrimination in school, denying them an education. These injuries compound and lead to poverty, homelessness, and violence.

The impact is felt hardest by transgender women of color, who confront racial discrimination, sex discrimination, and gender-identity discrimination. The intersection of these forms of discrimination can even be deadly, as it was for Shantee Tucker, a transgender woman of color from Philadelphia who was murdered last fall.

The protections provided by the Equality Act give LGBTQ people an equal chance at the American Dream. While discrimination and rejection have ended the lives of too many transgender people, many are succeeding, despite discrimination.

In Pennsylvania, Dr. Rachel Levine, a transgender woman, serves in the Governor's cabinet as secretary for health. Mara Keisling, a Pennsylvania native, is the founder and executive director of the National Center for Transgender Equality and a pioneer for civil rights protections. Danica Roem, the first transgender State legislator, serves in the Virginia House of Delegates. LaLa Zannell is fighting violence in New York City. Raffi Freedman-Gursan was the first openly transgender White House staffer. Miss Major Griffin-Gracy, who was at Stonewall, has spent her life fighting to end

the over-incarceration of transgender people. The list goes on and on.

I am proud that the House will finally act to provide Federal protections to LGBTQ people with passage of the Equality Act. The fight for equal rights is far from over, but I am proud to be part of a majority that prioritizes equal treatment for all of its citizens, regardless of whom they love.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

We, Madam Speaker, are here today on three very different pieces of legislation, which, unfortunately, makes this a complicated rule. One of our bills concerns civil rights, one concerns healthcare, and one concerns Native Americans. I will move through each of these bills relatively quickly, and then I want to address the process we followed to get here today.

The first bill, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5, is a complicated and complex piece of legislation that would make sweeping changes to our Nation's civil rights laws, if enacted. In general, the bill adds the terms "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" to the list of protected classes under the Civil Rights Act, joining classes like race, gender, religion, and national origin.

As I noted in our hearing yesterday, most Republicans in the House will oppose this bill not because we do not believe that all people should receive equal treatment under the law but because we have real concerns about how this bill will work in practice. A term like "gender identity" has such a vague definition that even proponents of the bill do not agree on exactly what the term means.

That should cause legislators to be especially thoughtful and provide clarity about what the term means and how the law will be applied. But we have not done so here.

Republicans have raised numerous questions about how this bill will work in practice. Will female athletes in junior high, high school, and college be forced to compete in women's athletics against competitors who were born biologically male? Will female sexual assault victims be forced to share vulnerable same-sex spaces like locker rooms and dressing rooms with other individuals who were born biologically male? And since the legislation appears to allow people to define their own gender identity, will it allow people to shift back and forth between gender as it suits them?

These are not rhetorical questions. They are real concerns that we have raised, with good reason, throughout the process.

H.R. 5 is known as the Equality Act, and I know every Member of the House, Republican and Democrat, agrees with

the principle that all people should be treated equally under the law. But even as we strive toward that goal, when we are dealing with legislation of this magnitude, we must consider how the bill will work in practice.

Unfortunately, I don't think my friends in the majority have clear answers to very legitimate questions. Last night, during debate at the Rules Committee, our concerns were dismissed as we were told that the courts and administrative bureaucrats would sort out these unanswered issues. That is simply unacceptable.

Why would we want any ambiguity when it comes to a person's civil rights? We should be very clear about congressional intent, and the only way to do that is to write a law the way you intend for it to be carried out. Sadly, this bill falls well short of that certainty.

The second bill, H.R. 987, is actually seven bills: three genuinely bipartisan bills addressing prescription drug costs and four partisan and controversial bills addressing ObamaCare.

As I pointed out last night in our hearing, I don't particularly understand what the majority is trying to accomplish here. There are three bills that are all bipartisan that could easily progress to becoming law. I am even a cosponsor of one of those bills. Yet, I have to vote against the entire package because I do not support the partisan and controversial bills attached by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, at some point, the majority needs to decide if they are here to score political points or if they are here to govern. If they want to continue scoring rhetorical victories, then by all means, they should keep doing what they are doing, keep putting up partisan bills that won't go anywhere in the Senate and won't be signed into law, keep putting up messaging bills for the purpose of signaling to their primary voters, and keep spending their days engaged in show votes that won't ever improve the lives of those they were elected to represent.

If they want to govern for the American people, then the majority must move forward with real legislation that can get real support here, in the Senate, and at the White House.

We had the chance to do that with this package. The majority chose not to do so. I think that is a real missed opportunity for us, both as an institution and as a country.

Finally, the third bill, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, is a matter I want to discuss at some length because I think there has been, frankly, a lot of misinformation put out about this particular piece of legislation.

The Mashpee Wampanoag is a federally recognized Tribe based in Mashpee, Massachusetts. H.R. 312 would simply reaffirm the taking of land into trust for the benefit of this Tribe.

When the Federal Government takes land into trust for a Tribe, it is reserv-

ing that land for the benefit of the Tribe and Tribal members both now and into the future. It ensures that the Tribes have a home, that they have a stable place to build communities and to marshal their resources and conduct business. It ensures that the land that was promised to Tribes, and that was held by those Tribes, in many cases for many centuries, remains in Tribal hands.

Holding land in trust is a commitment made to Tribes by the Federal Government. It affirms Tribes will continue to be able to exercise sovereignty over their own land. That is really all this issue is about today, whether or not the Mashpee Wampanoag will be able to exercise their own sovereignty over their own land.

Unfortunately, some who oppose this bill are doing so because they are viewing this issue through a purely political lens rather than what our own Constitution says about Tribal sovereignty. This isn't a bill about a particular use for the land, and it isn't a bill about particular Members of this institution or the Senate. Instead, this is a bill about keeping Federal promises to Tribes.

Our country hasn't always kept those promises, and we have an opportunity today to step up and make clear that regardless of what happened in the past, today, the Federal Government keeps its promises to Tribes, no ifs, ands, or buts.

Before I close, I would like to make a couple of points about the process this week, particularly on the Equality Act and the healthcare issue.

On the Equality Act, 35 amendments were proposed. I thought that many, if not most, of these should have been considered on the floor. Yet, in the final rule, not one amendment was made in order, and we are considering this bill under a closed rule.

The majority is choosing not to make in order many amendments that deserve our consideration on the floor, like Ms. HOLMES NORTON's amendment to clarify that Washington, D.C., residents cannot be excluded or disqualified from jury service based on sexual orientation or gender identity, or the bipartisan amendment that would restore the application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to this bill, or Representative JOHNSON's common-sense amendment clarifying that nothing in the act should be construed as to deny parents the right to be involved in their minor child's medical care. These are all deserving amendments that should have been heard on the floor, and yet the majority chose to make precisely none in order.

On H.R. 987, the majority went in a different direction. In total, 51 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, and 15 of those were sponsored by Republicans. Yet with today's rule, 27 amendments were made in order, but just one amendment was made in order that was sponsored by a Republican, along with one bipartisan

manager's amendment—one out of 15. All the remaining amendments, 92 percent of those made in order, were sponsored solely by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I think we can do better than that.

Last week, I reminded the House that when my party was in charge of the last Congress, we went out of our way to make minority and bipartisan amendments in order. Forty-five percent of all amendments made in order in the last Congress were sponsored solely by Democrats, while a further 17 percent were bipartisan.

As of today's rule, the stats are looking much worse for the current majority. Seventy-three percent of all amendments made in order were solely sponsored by Democrats through May 14. Thirteen percent are bipartisan. Just 14 percent were sponsored by Republicans.

We had an opportunity today, particularly on H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, to take steps toward remedying this issue.

I must continue to encourage my good friend, and he is my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to work with us to make more bipartisan and minority amendments in order and to ensure that all Members, regardless of party, have an opportunity to be heard on the floor, as he has often promised.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I would just note that, with respect to H.R. 5, we had regular order. H.R. 5, the Equality Act, went through the Committee on the Judiciary. It had a hearing, and then we also had a markup. This is a new process, apparently, since the last Congress. And then, of course, we had the Rules hearing last night.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her leadership and for the time.

Today is, indeed, a historic day. It is a day that we will say to the LGBTQ community across the land that you matter, that you count, that the Equality Act will be the new law of this country. It is a basic heralding of human decency.

America stands at a crucial crossroads in this generation's fight for civil rights. We should not have to remind our Republican colleagues that no one should ever be discriminated against because of who they are, yet here we are.

Without the explicit Federal protection provided in the Equality Act, the LGBTQ community is at risk of being marginalized, or worse, in the workplace, housing, education, and even in the military.

This administration is seeking to make our LGBTQ families and friends

not just second-class citizens, but to deny them the fundamental American rights etched into our Constitution.

Congress cannot erase hatred with legislation, but Congress has an obligation to lead, to stamp out discrimination wherever it exists.

We can and must all rise for the LGBTQ community.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself a few seconds to respond to my friend from Pennsylvania.

We don't consider the markup in committee a very good markup. Only four amendments were considered, none were accepted, and, frankly, a number of Members seeking recognition for amendments were not recognized. So to think that this was anything other than a train moving through a station, I think, is to mischaracterize how that particular markup worked.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my very good friend, fellow member of the Rules Committee, and also a leading member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker, you can imagine my surprise this morning checking the email and the Health 202, an email put out by The Washington Post—the Washington Post, for crying out loud—and here is the headline: "Democrats Are Putting a Political Pothole in the Way of Bipartisan Drug Pricing Bills." They go on to say: "ObamaCare battles threaten even the most bipartisan healthcare efforts on Capitol Hill."

What a strange turn of events.

So here we have a rule today that will allow a bill to be brought to the floor where the Democrats are using bipartisan drug pricing bills to pay for partisan politics.

Look, I am on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as the Rules Committee, so I am on the oldest and second oldest committees in the United States House of Representatives. We worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that the BLOCKING Act, the CREATES Act, and the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act would deliver drug pricing solutions to Americans.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that keeps the three drug policies and uses the savings—some \$5 billion from those policies—to pay for bipartisan public health priorities.

I also introduced the standalone bill, H.R. 2700, if you are keeping score at home. This is the Lowering Prescription Drug Costs and Extending Community Health Centers and Other Public Health Priorities Act. H.R. 2700 couples the bipartisan drug pricing policies with reauthorization of programs such as community health centers, special diabetes programs, and the National Health Service Corps.

Every Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee is a co-sponsor of H.R. 2700, signifying the

broad Republican support for both the drug pricing and the public health priorities.

Look, it is pretty clear: You can say that it is more important to have a navigated program that would never pass any cost-benefit analysis; you can say it is more important to have an earmark for the State of New Jersey to set up an ObamaCare exchange; or you can say it is more important to reauthorize Community Health Centers.

Reauthorizations are tough. We did multiple reauthorizations in the last Congress, and they are difficult to get across the line because so many people have so many opinions.

All of these programs are going to expire in September, and we have taken no activity towards reauthorization in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

These reauthorizations, again, take a substantial amount of time. The clock is ticking, and we should act as soon as possible.

Again, unfortunately, that amendment was not made in order, but I do encourage Members to look at H.R. 2700, a good bill. For this morning, I think The Washington Post had it right.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the time.

So maybe it is just me. You know, I am still suffering from trauma, having served in the minority under my Republican friends for 8 years where, routinely, we were given a process where we were almost always shut out.

In the last Congress, we had a record-breaking 103 closed rules on major bills—completely closed. You can't amend it. And they talk about all the amendments they made in order, but they don't talk about the thousands they did not make in order.

Now, look, I don't want them to feel the same way that I did in the minority. I want them to not have to go through the trauma that so many of us went through where we were routinely shut out. And that is why, when we came up with the Rules package, we did things like required that bills had to have hearings in committees of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee, that they had to have markups in the committee of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee.

I mean, they routinely brought legislation to the floor where committees of jurisdiction never had a hearing, never had a markup. They mysteriously appeared. They would come to the Rules Committee; they would get a closed rule; and then we were forced to vote up or down on it.

So I don't really appreciate being lectured on process. Yes, we need to do better, and, yes, I understand that my

Republican friends want more amendments in order, but let's not forget why we are here today. We are here to pass a historic civil rights bill. We are here to pass the Equality Act.

When I look at the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee, amendment after amendment would target trans Americans and carve out ways for discrimination to continue. This is on a bill that is meant to eliminate discrimination. They were trying to enshrine discrimination. They were trying to weaken the Civil Rights Act. And, quite frankly, I think most of us felt: You know what? We are not going to allow that to happen.

That is not an appropriate use of the rules of the House, to try to take away the rights of people in this country, to try to allow discrimination to continue.

We believe too strongly in the ideals of the Civil Rights Act to risk letting it be transformed into another weapon for division and discrimination. I mean, we listened to groups like the National Urban League, the National Action Network, the NAACP, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and others that asked us to give this bill a straight up-or-down vote.

And let's be clear, Madam Speaker, a good process is about more than just amendments, as I mentioned. This bill had a hearing, and it had a markup.

On the healthcare bill that we are going to deal with, it is about lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

My friends on the other side of the aisle spent what seemed like an eternity trying to rip away healthcare protections for people, I mean, bringing up one bill after another after another to the floor that never went through regular order, that would literally take away protections from people with pre-existing conditions.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, they did nothing to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Then we had an election in November, and the big issue was healthcare. People didn't want to have their healthcare protections ripped away. And now, all of a sudden, they are converts, and they say they want to protect people's healthcare and expand healthcare protections.

The bottom line is this: We are not perfect all the time, and we need to do better, but I believe that we are improving the process. I look forward to working with the gentleman, the ranking member from Oklahoma, to try to find ways forward.

But on the legislation here today that we are going to consider, this is historic legislation. Quite frankly, every Member of this House who wants to end discrimination in this country ought to

support the Equality Act, and every Member of this House who wants to deal with the high cost of prescription drugs ought to support that bill as well.

Madam Speaker, with that, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for just a few minutes to respond to my good friend, the chairman. I want to tell you, there is nobody I hold in higher regard in the House of Representatives than Chairman MCGOVERN, nobody I consider a better personal friend, nobody I consider a more responsible Member.

On this, we disagree. The gentleman is right, neither side is perfect. In this case, we are going to bring attention to this amendment issue until we see results. That is precisely what my friend did when he was in the minority, and there are some times we should have listened to him and we did not.

In this case, I think the imbalance is so egregious that we are going to continue to make that case until we see a change. Maybe we won't. Hopefully we will, because I know my friend approaches this with good intentions.

Secondly, I would say this bill was so important, the Equality Act, it ought to have amendments. That is the point. That is how you build consensus. I think they are missing the opportunity to get a lot of people who would support the basic concept that they are trying to advance.

And, finally, on the drug bill, I have just got to be honest with you. When they had a chance to pass something that would work and chose to bundle it with something that they knew couldn't pass, that makes me wonder how serious they are about dealing with that problem.

But, hopefully, we will get an opportunity to deal with that again. And that is an area we know we can work together on. We have proved it in committee.

So, with that, I look forward to continuing to work with my good friend, the chairman. I know that we will occasionally have differences. That is what this is all about. We will work those differences out.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my very good friend, who also is a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation, H.R. 5.

Contrary to what has just been said on the floor, this bill does not end discrimination. In fact, the Equality Act imposes top-down, government-led discrimination against all Americans who hold a differing view of human sexuality and gender.

This grossly misnamed bill punishes everyday citizens, silences free speech and viewpoint disagreements, and dis-

criminate against people of faith. In reality, this bill should be called the women's inequality act.

The policies of H.R. 5 have already been used to trample female athletics, eliminate safe spaces for women, harm children, terminate parental rights, and undermine the free exercise of religious freedom.

The legislation also provides for a universal right to abortion, compromises taxpayers' safeguards against funding abortion, and eliminates conscious protections for healthcare providers that do not want to participate in an abortion.

As a former track coach, I am deeply committed to providing women and girls with a level playing field. Title IX, however, becomes irrelevant under the women's inequality act.

Vulnerable women seeking haven in homeless women's shelters will be revictimized under H.R. 5. This is already happening.

In California, women who were sexually harassed in the shower by a biological male were threatened with expulsion from the women's shelter.

In Alaska, a women's shelter is being sued for sending a transitioning individual to the hospital instead of letting him sleep 3 feet away from rape victims.

This is absurd. Under H.R. 5, women-only spaces will be a thing of the past.

This bill also places children at risk of medical experimentation and bleak futures when they are given the right to hormone blockers and sex change operations.

□ 1300

Most children, 98 percent of boys and 88 percent of girls, who question their gender identity will grow into their birth gender after passing through puberty.

Parents who dare to oppose doctors using off-label drugs that may sterilize their child, or performing life-altering surgical procedures, will be considered abusive and neglectful. This has already happened with an Ohio couple who lost custody of their daughter.

For the first time ever, H.R. 5 waives the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, enabling unhindered government discrimination against the faith community. It also actively prohibits the religious community from partnering with the Federal Government.

Catholic schools will no longer be able to participate in the National School Lunch Program. Jewish synagogues will lose Federal grant funding to protect against terror threats, and houses of worship will lose FEMA disaster aid unless—here is the catch—they abandon their core teachings on morality, marriage, and sexuality.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle,

especially those who claim to be pro-women and pro-children, need to stop this devastating legislation.

The future of women's rights, privacy, protection, and athletic potential depends on it.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for the rule and for H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Recent years have brought extraordinary progress in the fight for full equality for our LGBTQ community. Like millions of others across the country, I joined with friends and family to celebrate Supreme Court rulings paving the way for same-sex couples to marry. But in the midst of these joyful and historic victories, we knew that the work was just beginning.

Though LGBTQ people could now get married, in a majority of States they could still be fired for having a picture of their spouse on their desk or kicked out of their home just for being who they are. The fact is, LGBTQ people are still at risk of discrimination across key areas of life in huge swaths of our country.

Recent national surveys of LGBTQ people show that 42 percent of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people; and 78 percent of transgender people have experienced discrimination or harassment on the job because of who they are.

Only 21 States have explicit laws barring discrimination based on sexual orientation and employment, housing and public accommodations, and only 20 States have such protections for gender identity.

The time to end this patchwork of protections once and for all is now, and to do that, we must pass this important legislation.

The promotion of fairness and justice is a hallmark of who we are as Americans. Everyone should be afforded all of the rights provided for in our Constitution and outlined in our Declaration of Independence. These rights are fundamental to all human beings, and all Americans deserve the same civil rights regardless of gender, race, and sexual orientation. We don't need to amend that.

Let's pass the rule and let's pass the Equality Act.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to inform the House that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019.

This bill includes four titles, three of which passed the House last Congress, and one of which has already passed the House this Congress on suspension.

My amendment will also include three additional provisions agreed to by the Senate when they considered their version of this bill, so that what we will debate will be identical to what

the Senate passed with an overwhelming majority vote in February.

The most critical title of H.R. 336, in my opinion, is the Combating BDS Act of 2019, which will allow a State or local government to adopt measures to divest assets from entities using boycotts, disbursements, or sanctions to influence Israel's policy.

Madam Speaker, yesterday was the 71st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. I can think of no better way to celebrate Israel's independence, reaffirm our support for Israel, and indicate our ongoing commitment to a peaceful and more secure Middle East than to consider and pass H.R. 336 immediately.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters, first, a letter from the National Partnership for Women & Families urging support; second, a letter from the Human Rights Campaign, also urging support for H.R. 5; third, a letter from the American Federation of Government Employees; and finally, a letter from several civil rights groups, all urging support for H.R. 5.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that has fought for decades to advance the rights and well-being of America's women and families. We work to foster a society in which workplaces are fair, equitable and family friendly; where everyone has access to quality, affordable health care, including reproductive health care; and where every person has the opportunity to achieve economic security and live with dignity.

We write to voice our strong support for the Equality Act (H.R. 5) and to urge you to vote YES on this groundbreaking legislation. We also urge you to vote NO on any motion to recommit that may be offered to undermine or alter the Equality Act or otherwise harm civil liberties.

Despite significant progress, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) people still face considerable discrimination and lack necessary protections across the country. While some states have enacted laws that protect against discrimination, the patchwork nature of these protections means that millions of people continue to face harassment, exclusion and uncertainty that negatively impact their safety, their day-to-day lives, their families and their ability to participate fully in society.

Part of achieving our nation's promise of equality, dignity and fairness is ensuring that all people, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, have equal oppor-

tunity to succeed. No one should have access to services or doors to opportunity closed because of outdated gender stereotypes about how people should act, look or behave. This requires stronger national nondiscrimination protections based on sex, sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Equality Act is historic civil rights legislation that would amend and supplement the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other key federal nondiscrimination laws that provide protection from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin or religion. This legislation would strengthen protections from discrimination on the basis of sex, and add critical new protections from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Specifically, it would provide clear, explicit protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in education, employment, housing, credit, federally funded programs and federal jury services. These protections are essential in ensuring that LGBTQ people have the right to live with dignity and equality.

While the primary focus of the Equality Act is on LGBTQ people, the Act would also close longstanding gaps in federal law and provide important new legal protections for all women by, for the first time, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in public spaces and services and in all federally-funded activities. This means that, for example, when women experience harassment as customers in restaurants, stores, hotels, taxis or airports, there will now be a remedy. The law will also ensure that breastfeeding parents aren't excluded from or treated less favorably in public places just for feeding their children, and it will make clear that pharmacies can't refuse to fill a woman's birth control prescription.

The bill's provisions that would ensure that sex does not stand as a barrier to full participation in federally funded programs or activities will mean, for example, that a developer with a federal grant couldn't discriminate against women-owned businesses in its contracting. Women would also have new tools to challenge a police department's systematically inadequate response to sexual violence and intimate partner violence, if the police department received federal funds; and would be able to challenge denials of reproductive health care where a federally-funded entity otherwise provides comparable or comprehensive health care.

These protections against sex discrimination are a critical step forward in advancing women's equality in this country.

As a leading national women's rights organization we also feel compelled to state emphatically that the Equality Act's protections for transgender and gender nonconforming people in no way undermine the rights or protections afforded to women and do not jeopardize women's safety or their ability to participate fully or equally in sport or in any other aspect of our society. Transgender women are women, and any attempt to mischaracterize their gender identity or suggest that they are trying to "take advantage" of protected class status fundamentally misunderstands the reality of transgender people's lives and experiences. Furthermore, it causes real harm to the more than one million Americans who identify as transgender, a population already subject to high rates of violence and abuse, negative mental and physical health outcomes, and experiences with discrimination and stigmatization.

The Equality Act is a long-overdue step forward in extending civil rights protections to millions of women and LGBTQ people. Establishing clear protections is critical at a time when vulnerable communities are

under attack. The Equality Act would provide a consistent, national standard and ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live safely and with dignity, to advance at work, to provide for one's family and to thrive economically.

Sincerely,

National Partnership for Women & Families.

HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest civil rights organization working to achieve lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) equality, I write to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and against any Motion to Recommit. We will consider both key votes.

Everyone—including LGBTQ people—should have an opportunity to earn a living and provide a home for their families without fear of constant harassment or discrimination. The Equality Act would update our nation's existing civil rights laws to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity, which would finally provide consistent non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people across key areas of life, including employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service. This would ensure LGBTQ people have access to the exact same protections as are currently provided under federal law based on other protected characteristics.

Currently, 30 states lack non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people. The patchwork nature of current laws leaves millions of people subject to uncertainty and potential discrimination that impacts their safety, their families, and their day-to-day lives. In fact, two-thirds of LGBTQ Americans report having experienced discrimination. The Equality Act would provide a nationwide standard for non-discrimination protections.

The Equality Act has unprecedented support. More than 200 major corporations have endorsed the legislation, as well as more than 40 trade associations including U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Recent polling finds that a growing majority of Americans—including Republicans, Democrats and Independents—support LGBTQ non-discrimination protections and LGBTQ equality. A recent survey by PRRI found that nearly seven in 10 Americans support laws like the Equality Act. More than 500 national, state, and local organizations have endorsed the legislation, including social justice, religious, medical, and child welfare organizations.

Again, I urge you to vote in favor of the Equality Act and against any Motion to Recommit.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions or need more information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

DAVID STACY,
Government Affairs Director,
Human Rights Campaign.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 700,000 federal and District of Columbia government employees represented by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE) I write to urge

you to vote yes on H.R. 5, the Equality Act. The Equality Act is long overdue legislation with bipartisan support that affirms in the United States all people should be treated equally.

Currently, it is not a violation of federal civil rights law for employers to fire, landlords to deny housing, or for schools to withhold educational opportunities from people solely because they are a member of the LGBTQ community. While some jurisdictions provide protections to the LGBTQ community, the federal government cannot remain silent in the face of continued discrimination. The Equality Act extends protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in employment, housing, access to public places, federal funding, credit education, and jury service. Federal workers provide services to all members of the public without discrimination and expect our nation's laws to protect all individuals in the same manner.

The Equality Act is endorsed by civil and human rights advocates, educators, the business community, and labor unions because the United States can only move forward together when all, including citizens who are LGBTQ, have full protection under the law from discrimination. Again, I urge you to vote in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Sincerely,

ALETHEA PREDEOUX,
Director, Legislative Department.

MARCH 12, 2019.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SCHUMER AND SPEAKER PELOSI: We write today to memorialize the shared agreement of African American civil rights groups regarding the importance of ensuring the protection of the provisions of core civil rights statutes e.g. the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, etc., even as legislators pursue amendments to those statutes to add additional protections against discrimination. We stand in solidarity and support with our partners and colleagues in a shared commitment to ensuring that these protections are extended. But we have also collectively agreed that these efforts must not result in a weakening of the provisions and protections of our bedrock civil rights statutes, each of which represents the powerful and unrelenting demand of civil rights activists and leaders—often at risk to their own lives. While we have been gratified during our conversations with House and Senate committee leaders and bill sponsors, we regard this matter as one of such importance that we are memorializing by this letter the understanding we have shared in our conversations for efforts that may arise by individual legislators or groups during the process of advancing these bills.

The reasons for our caution and concern are, no doubt, evident to you. The current environment is one in which we have seen alarming animus and hostility to various ethnic and minority groups, as well as legal challenges to what were once regarded as unassailable civil rights legal standards. Without question we are confronting a concerted and unrelenting effort to chip away and eviscerate existing civil rights protections. This means that there are inherent dangers in opening any civil rights statutes to legislative debate and review. Thus, the efforts currently underway to extend anti-discrimination protection in our core civil rights statutes, must not be advanced without the clear and explicit agreement among sponsors,

committee leadership and party leadership that proposed amendments to our civil rights statutes will be withdrawn should efforts be introduced to weaken or diminish the existing provisions of those statutes.

Bills which are of immediate concern include, The Equality Act and the American Housing and Mobility Act; however, it is our understanding that there may be others. Below is a list of some of the safeguards/guardrails we feel must be in place if/when legislation proposing to amend civil rights statutes is introduced. Each of these have been discussed and agreed to by civil rights groups, as well as the current sponsors of the Equality Act. They include:

Establish a strong legislative record for any proposed changes to core Civil Rights statutes. This standard must be maintained; Hearings, reports, testimony, etc.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Sponsors that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced the bill will be pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

Written assurances from Sponsors that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced* they will withdraw their introduction of the bill and work to have the bill pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

A demonstrated and shared understanding from party leadership and legislative sponsors of the ability to impact the process once legislation is introduced given current political dynamics, including an explanation of the procedural path forward and the procedural path for withdrawal if that becomes necessary.

Inclusion of Congressional Findings section in every bill.

Rollout strategies which include explicit statement(s) about need to preserve existing protections and intent to withdraw the bill if existing protections are threatened in any manner.

Continue to explore standalone legislation that does not amend the existing statute(s), should this prove to be the safer course.

The history of civil rights in this country is one fraught with violence, hostility and long suffering. The fight to enforce those rights continues to this day with resistance and opposition morphing and growing. As stewards of these critical laws, we all have a responsibility and obligation to ensure that the protections they embody are preserved. We therefore want to be clear and direct in expressing our insistence that any legislation proposing to amend legacy civil rights statutes which is permitted to move forward, do so ONLY when there is a commitment and agreement to do no harm to the existing statutes and where the safeguards/guardrails outlined in this letter are put in place.

Sincerely,

SHERILYN IFILL,
President and Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.

HILLARY O. SHELTON,
Director, Washington Bureau/SVP for Advocacy and Policy, NAACP.

REVEREND AL SHARPTON,
President and Founder, National Action Network.

MELANIE L. CAMPBELL,

*President and CEO,
National Coalition
on Black Civic Part-
icipation.*

MARC H. MORIAL,
*President and Chief
Executive Officer,
National Urban
League.*

KRISTEN CLARKE,
*President & Executive
Director, Lawyers'
Committee for Civil
Rights Under the
Law.*

VANITA GUPTA,
*President and CEO,
Leadership Con-
ference for Civil and
Human Rights.*

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, for nearly a decade, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans get the care that they need. It has allowed parents to keep their kids on their own insurance plans, and it has protected millions and millions of Americans who are living with preexisting conditions, and that piece is so important.

It means that Americans living with cancer, living with heart disease, and living with diabetes can no longer be thrown off their plans or denied coverage simply because of their medical history.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, more than 5.4 million people depend on these protections to treat their asthma, to afford their insulin, and to receive treatments for other preexisting illnesses.

Madam Speaker, I promise these families that I will keep fighting to keep them healthy, which is why this week I am voting for the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drugs Costs Act which will ban junk insurance plans that don't offer sufficient coverage, bring lower-priced generic prescription drugs to market more quickly, and invest in helping Americans sign up for healthcare.

That is what Democrats are focused on, moving forward, making sure seniors, veterans, and working families across our Nation have the healthcare they need. I hope the current administration will see this as an opportunity to work with our House majority in order to lower the cost of prescription medications, and I hope Republicans in Congress will join us in our mission to keep working for the people and to make sure that every American can afford their prescription medications and their healthcare.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to urge opposition to the rule. The majority has proposed three different measures today, and while I am a supporter of the bill concerning Tribal rights, I am opposed to H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, and I regret that.

Quite frankly, had the process on these bills been different, I think the vote that we would see in this Chamber would be very different today. I think, literally, a more fulsome and more open process and amendments on H.R. 5 might have unlocked dozens of additional votes for that legislation.

I think with H.R. 987 we don't have to speculate. We know three of those bills passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee with unanimous, bipartisan support, all of them dealing with drug prices. That would have been an easy vote. We could have moved that through.

My friends could have still brought the other four matters that they cared about under a rule, brought it to the floor. They have got the votes to move it. It would have precisely the same prospects of success it is going to have in the United States Senate.

The President has already made it clear, since he issued a statement, that he is very likely to veto it if it were to make it to his desk. So why in the world we threw away an opportunity to do some good for the American people in an area where we agree, in order to advance something that we know cannot become law, is mystifying to me, to say the least.

Again, H.R. 5 is well-intentioned and designed to expand civil rights, but it also adds a term with no clear definition to our civil rights laws without regard for how it will work in practice.

H.R. 987 has four bills that are unacceptable, three bills that are eminently acceptable. I do want to close though on a positive note.

Madam Speaker, I do applaud my friends for bringing the Native American issue to fruition today. I am going to be opposing them on the rule but supporting them on that legislation. I think it was a very wise decision to put it under a rule, quite frankly, and I applaud my good friend Chairman GRIJALVA for working with my good friend Chairman MCGOVERN and making sure that that happened. This important piece of legislation, which, quite frankly, is important not just to the Tribe in question, but establishes the principle that we won't let land going into trust be taken out of trust, is very important.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 364 organizations endorsing the Equality Act, as well as a list of companies supporting H.R. 5 who employ over 9.8 million workers in the United States.

EQUALITY ACT

364 ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE EQUALITY ACT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

9 to 5, National Association of Working Women; A Better Balance; ACRIA; ADAP

Advocacy Association; Advocates for Youth; AFL-CIO; African American Ministers In Action; AIDS United; Alan and Leslie Chambers Foundation; American Association for Access, Equity and Diversity; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Atheists; American Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union; American Conference of Cantors.

American Counseling Association; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; American Humanist Association; American Medical Association; American Psychological Association; American School Counselor Association; amfAR, Foundation for AIDS Research; Anti-Defamation League; Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA); Association of Flight Attendants—CWA; Athlete Ally; Auburn Seminary; Autistic Self Advocacy Network.

BALM Ministries; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black and Pink; Campaign for Youth Justice; Caring Across Generations; Catholics for Choice; Center for American Progress; Center for Black Equity; Center for Inclusivity; Center for Inquiry; Center for LGBTQ and Gender Studies; CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Child Welfare League of America; Coalition of Labor Union Women.

Communications Workers of America; Community Access National Network (CANN); Consortium for Children; Council for Global Equality; DignityUSA; Disciples Justice Action Network; Disciples LGBTQ+ Alliance; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF); Equal Rights Advocates; Equality Federation; Estuary Space; Faith in Public Life; Family Equality Council; Feminist Majority; The Fenway Institute.

FORGE, Inc.; Forward Together; Freedom Center for Social Justice; Freedom for All Americans; Freedom to Work; Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC); Gender Spectrum; Generation Progress; Georgetown University Law Center—Civil Rights Clinic; Girls Inc.; GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBTQ Equality; Global Justice Institute; Metropolitan Community Churches; GLSEN; Guttmacher Institute; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.

Harm Reduction Coalition; HealthHIV; Hindu American Foundation; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic Health Network; HIV Medicine Association; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights Watch; Impact Fund; In Our Own Voice; National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Indivisible; Integrity USA; Episcopal Rainbow; Interfaith Alliance; International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers; International Association of Providers of AIDS Care.

Japanese American Citizens League; Jewish Women International; Justice in Aging; Keshet; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA); Lambda Legal; Latino Commission on AIDS; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; League of United Latin American Citizens; Lesbian and Gay Veterinary Medical Association (LGVMA); LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute; Main Street Alliance; MANA, A National Latina Organization; MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger; Men of Reform Judaism.

Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metropolitan Community Churches; MomsRising; More Light Presbyterians; Movement Advancement Project; Muslim Advocates; Muslim Public Affairs Council; Muslims for Progressive Values; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice America; NASTAD (National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors); National AIDS Housing Coalition; National Alliance for Partnerships in

Equity (NAPE); National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF).

National Association for Female Executives; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of School Psychologists; National Association of School Superintendents; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center For Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center on Adoption and Permanency; National Coalition for LGBT Health; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; National Council for Occupational Safety and Health (COSH); National Council of Jewish Women; National Crittenton.

National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Hispanic Media Coalition; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Latinx Psychological Association; National LGBT Chamber of Commerce; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National PTA; National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance (NQAPIA); National Taskforce on Tradeswomen Issues.

National Trans Bar Association; National Urban League; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; NEAT—National Equality Action Team; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New Ways Ministry; NMAC; North American Council on Adoptable Children; Out & Equal Workplace Advocates; OutServe-SLDN; Oxfam America; Parity; People For the American Way; PFLAG National.

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Positive Women's Network-USA; Pride at Work; Promundo-US; Public Justice; Rabbinical Assembly; Reconciling Ministries Network; ReconcilingWorks: Lutherans for Full Participation; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; RootsAction; Ryan White Medical Providers Coalition.

SafeBAE; SAGE; Secular Coalition for America; Secular Policy Institute; SER Jobs for Progress National Inc.; Service Employees International Union; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); Souforce; Southern HIV/AIDS Strategy Initiative (SASI); Stop Sexual Assault in Schools (SSAIS); SurvJustice; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The AIDS Institute; The Episcopal Church; The Inanna Project.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; The National LGBTQ Workers Center; The TransLatin@ Coalition; The Trevor Project; The Tyler Clementi Foundation; The Williams Institute; Transgender Law Center; Transgender Legal Defense & Education Fund; Treatment Action Group; True Colors United; UFCW OUTreach; Ultra Violet; UMForward; (un)common good collective; UnidosUS.

Unión = Fuerza Latinx Institute; Union for Reform Judaism; Union of Affirming Christians; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; United State of Women; United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism; URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; Voice for Adoption; Voices for Progress; Vote Common Good, Greater Things; Voto

Latino; Witness to Mass Incarceration; Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics, and Ritual (WATER); Young Feminists & Allies: National Organization for Women's (NOW) Inaugural Virtual Chapter.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alaskans Together For Equality, AK.
AIDS Alabama, AL.
Equality Alabama, AL.
Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence, AZ.
Equality Arizona, AZ.
9to5 California, CA.
Bienestar Human Services, CA.
California Employment Lawyers Association, CA.
California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network, CA.
Equality California, CA.
Hollywood NOW, CA.
Latino Equality Alliance, CA.
Legal Aid At Work, CA.
LGBT Center OC, CA.
LGBT Community Center of the Desert, CA.
Missiongathering Christian Church, CA.
Religious Coalition for Reproductive Right—California, CA.
Stonewall Democratic Club, CA.
The Diversity Center of Santa Cruz County, CA.
The Los Angeles LGBT Center, CA.
The Source LGBT+ Center, CA.
9to5 Colorado, CO.
One Colorado, CO.
Out Boulder County, CO.
Rocky Mountain CARES, CO.
Triangle Community Center Inc., CT.
Asian/Pacific Islander Domestic Violence Resource Project, DC.
GLAA, DC.
The DC Center for the LGBT Community, DC.
Trans-Latinx DMV (DC, Maryland and Virginia), DC.
Whitman-Walker Health, DC.
Compass LGBTQ Community Center, FL.
Equality Florida, FL.
QLatinx, FL.
The Pride Center at Equality Park, FL.
Visuality, Inc., FL.
9to5 Georgia, GA.
Georgia Equality, GA.
Lake Oconee Community Church, GA.
The Rush Center, GA.
One Iowa, IA.
AIDS Foundation of Chicago, IL.
Arab American Family Services, IL.
Association of Latinas & Latinos Motivating Action (ALMA), IL.
Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network, Life Span, & Resilience, IL.
Equality Illinois, IL.
Illinois Accountability Initiative, IL.
Pride Action Tank, IL.
Resilience, formerly Rape Victim Advocates, IL.
United Latinx Pride, IL.
Women Employed, IL.
Indiana Youth Group, IN.
End Rape on Campus, LA.
Louisiana Progress Action, LA.
Louisiana Trans Advocates, LA.
MassEquality, MA.
FreeState Justice, MD.
Gender Rights Maryland, MD.
Public Justice Center, MD.
Equality Maine, ME.
Affirmations, MI.
Equality Michigan, MI.
Kalamazoo Gay Lesbian Resource Center, MI.
Ruth Ellis Center, Inc., MI.
Gender Justice, MN.
OutFront MN, MN.
PROMO, MO.
St. Louis Effort for AIDS, MO.
Montana Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, MT.
Charlotte Clergy Coalition for Justice, NC.
Equality North Carolina, NC.
Latinos in the Deep South, NC.
National Organization for Women Charlotte chapter, NC.
North Dakota Human Rights Coalition, ND.
OutNebraska, NE.
New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, NH.
Garden State Equality, NJ.
Hudson Pride Center, NJ.
Equality New Mexico, NM.
KWH Law Center for Social Justice & Change, NM.
Southwest Women's Law Center, NM.
Tewa Women United, NM.
Association of Legal Aid Attorneys (ALAA) of UAW 2325, LGBTQ+ Caucus, NY.
Brooklyn Community Pride Center, NY.
Callen-Lorde Community Health Center, NY.
Empire State Pride Agenda, NY.
Equality New York, NY.
Forefront Church NYC, NY.
Gay & Lesbian Independent Democrats (GLID), NY.
Gender Equality Law Center, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of Greater New York, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of New York, NY.
Sakhi for South Asian Women, NY.
The Volunteer Lawyers Project of Onondaga County, Inc., NY.
Theatre of the Oppressed NYC, NY.
VillageCare, NY.
Equality Ohio, OH.
Ohio Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, OH.
TransOhio, OH.
Freedom Oklahoma, OK.
Basic Rights Oregon, OR.
Cascade AIDS Project, OR.
Christ Church: Portland, OR.
Oregon Abuse Advocates & Survivors in Service, OR.
Mazzoni Center, PA.
Ni-ta-nee NOW (Centre County, PA), PA.
PA Religious Coalition for Reproductive Justice, PA.
The Montgomery County LGBT Business Council, PA.
PA Religious Coalition for Reproductive Justice, PA.
Washington County Gay Straight Alliance, Inc., PA.
Women's Law Project, PA.
New Voices for Reproductive Justice, PA and OH.
Women's Rights and Empowerment Network (WREN), SC.
Equality South Dakota, SD.
Tennessee Equality Project, TN.
American Association of University Women Texas (AAUW Texas), TX.
Cathedral of Hope United Church of Christ, TX.
Equality Texas, TX.
Esperanza Peace and Justice Center, TX.
Open Arms Rape Crisis Center & LGBT+ Services, TX.
Resource Center, TX.
Texas Freedom Network, TX.
The Afya Center, TX.
Transgender Education Network of Texas (TENT), TX.
Equality Utah, UT.
Diversity Richmond, VA.
Equality Virginia, VA.
Entre Hermanos, WA.
Gay City: Seattle's LGBTQ Center, WA.
Gender Justice League, WA.
Legal Voice, WA.
Oasis Youth Center, WA.
Rainbow Center, WA.

9to5 Wisconsin, WI.
 AIDS Resource Center of Wisconsin, WI.
 FAIR Wisconsin, WI.
 Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault, WI.

EQUALITY ACT

The Business Coalition for the Equality Act is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Equality Act, which would finally guarantee explicit, permanent protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people under our existing civil rights laws.

The companies:

Employ over 9.8 million workers in the U.S.

Have combined revenue that exceeds \$4.2 trillion.

Have operations in all 50 States:

A.T. Kearney Inc., Chicago, IL.
 Abercrombie & Fitch Co., New Albany, OH.
 Accenture, New York, NY.
 Adobe Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
 ADP, Roseland, NJ.
 Advanced Micro Devices Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
 Airbnb Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Alaska Airlines, Seattle, WA.
 Alcoa Corp., Pittsburgh, PA.
 Ally Financial Inc., Detroit, MI.
 Amalgamated Bank, New York, NY.
 Amazon.com Inc., Seattle, WA.
 American Airlines, Fort Worth, TX.
 American Eagle Outfitters Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.
 American Express Global Business Travel, Jersey City, NJ.
 Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA.
 Arconic, New York, NY.
 Ascena Retail Group Inc., Mahwah, NJ.
 Aspen Skiing Company LLC, Aspen, CO.
 AT&T Inc., Dallas, TX.
 Atlassian, San Francisco, CA.
 Bain & Co. Inc./Bridgespan Group, Boston, MA.
 Bank of America Corp., Charlotte, NC.
 Bayer U.S. LLC, Whippany, NJ.
 BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ.
 Best Buy Co. Inc., Richfield, MN.
 Biogen, Cambridge, MA.
 Boehringer Ingelheim USA Corp., Ridgefield, CT.
 Booz Allen Hamilton Inc., McLean, VA.
 Boston Scientific Corp., Marlborough, MA.
 Box Inc., Redwood City, CA.
 Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., New York, NY.
 Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc., Lake Success, NY.
 Brown-Forman Corp., Louisville, KY.
 Caesars Entertainment Corp., Las Vegas, NV.
 Capital One Financial Corp., McLean, VA.
 Cardinal Health Inc., Dublin, OH.
 Cargill Inc., Wayzata, MN.
 Chevron Corp., San Ramon, CA.
 Chobani, Norwich, NY.
 Choice Hotels International Inc., Rockville, MD.
 Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
 Citigroup Inc., New York, NY.
 Citrix Systems Inc., Fort Lauderdale, FL.
 CME Group Inc., Chicago, IL.
 CNA Financial Corporation, Chicago, IL.
 Coca-Cola Co., The, Atlanta, GA.
 Compass Bancshares Inc. (BBVA Compass), Birmingham, AL.
 Corning, Corning, NY.
 Converse Inc., Boston, MA.
 Cox Enterprises Inc., Atlanta, GA.
 CSAA Insurance Group, Walnut Creek, CA.
 Cummins Inc., Columbus, IN.
 CVS Health Corp., Woonsocket, RI.
 Danone North America, White Plains, NY.
 Darden Restaurants Inc., Orlando, FL.
 Deloitte LLP, New York, NY.
 Dell Technologies Inc., Round Rock, TX.
 Depository Trust & Clearing Corp., The, New York, NY.

Diageo North America, Norwalk, CT.
 Dow Chemical Co., The Midland, MI.
 Dropbox Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. (DuPont), Wilmington, DE.
 Eastern Bank Corp., Boston, MA.
 Eaton Corp., Cleveland, OH.
 eBay Inc., San Jose, CA.
 Ecolab Inc., St. Paul, MN.
 Edison International, Rosemead, CA.
 Ernst & Young LLP, New York, NY.
 Estee Lauder Companies Inc., The, New York, NY.
 Evolent Health Inc., Arlington, VA.
 Exelon Corp., Chicago, IL.
 Expedia Group, Bellevue, WA.
 Facebook Inc., Menlo Park, CA.
 First Data Corp., Atlanta, GA.
 Food Lion, Salisbury, NC.
 Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 General Electric Co., Boston, MA.
 General Mills Inc., Minneapolis, MN.
 General Motors Co., Detroit, MI.
 Giant of Maryland LLC, Landover, MD.
 Gilead Sciences Inc., Foster City, CA.
 Glassdoor Inc., Mill Valley, CA.
 Google Inc., Mountain View, CA.
 Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America, The, New York, NY.
 Gusto, San Francisco, CA.
 HERE North America LLC, Chicago, IL.
 Hershey Co., The, Hershey, PA.
 Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co., Palo Alto, CA.
 Hilton Inc., McLean, VA.
 HP Inc., Palo Alto, CA.
 HSF Affiliates LLC, Irvine, CA.
 HSN Inc. St., Petersburg, FL.
 Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP, New York, NY.
 Hyatt Hotels Corp., Chicago, IL.
 IBM Corp., Armonk, NY.
 IHS Markit Ltd., New York, NY.
 IKEA Holding US Inc., Conshohocken, PA.
 Ingersoll-Rand Company, Davidson, NC.
 Insight Enterprises Inc., Tempe, AZ.
 Intel Corp., Santa Clara, CA.
 Intercontinental Hotels Group Americas, Atlanta, GA.
 Iron Mountain Inc., Boston, MA.
 John Hancock Financial Services Inc., Boston, MA.
 Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, NJ.
 JPMorgan Chase & Co., New York, NY.
 Juniper Networks Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
 Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA.
 Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, MI.
 Kenneth Cole Productions Inc., New York, NY.
 KPMG LLP, New York, NY.
 Lendlease Americas Inc., New York, NY.
 Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, CA.
 Linden Research Inc., Davis, CA.
 Lush Fresh Handmade Cosmetics, Wilmington, NC.
 Lyft Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Macy's Inc., Cincinnati, OH.
 Marriott International Inc., Bethesda, MD.
 Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., Springfield, MA.
 Mastercard, Purchase, NY.
 Medtronic PLC, Minneapolis, MN.
 Merck, Kenilworth, NJ.
 Meredith Corp. Des Moines, IA.
 MGM Resorts International, Las Vegas, NV.
 Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA.
 Mitchell Gold + Bob Williams, Taylorsville, NC.
 Moody's Corp., New York, NY.
 Morgan Stanley, New York, NY.
 Nationwide, Columbus, OH.
 Navient, Wilmington, DE.
 Navigant Consulting Inc., Chicago, IL.
 Netflix Inc., Los Gatos, CA.
 Nike Inc., Beaverton, OR.
 Northrop Grumman Corp., Falls Church, VA.

Nuance Communications, Burlington, MA.
 Office Depot Inc., Boca Raton, FL.
 Oracle Corp., Redwood City, CA.
 Patreon Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Paul Hastings LLP, Los Angeles, CA.
 PepsiCo Inc., Purchase, NY.
 Pfizer Inc., New York, NY.
 Pinterest Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 PNC Financial Services Group Inc., The, Pittsburgh, PA.
 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, New York, NY.
 Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, OH.
 Pure Storage Inc., Mountain View, CA.
 QUALCOMM Inc., San Diego, CA.
 Realogy Holdings Corp., Madison, NJ.
 Replacements Ltd., McLeansville, NC.
 Royal Bank of Canada, New York, NY.
 S&P Global Inc., New York, NY.
 Salesforce, San Francisco, CA.
 SAP America Inc., Newtown Square, PA.
 Seagate Technology plc, Cupertino, CA.
 Shire PLC, Lexington, MA.
 Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP, Kansas City, MO.
 Shutterstock Inc., New York, NY.
 Siemens Corp., Washington, DC.
 Sodexo Inc., Gaithersburg, MD.
 Spotify USA Inc., New York, NY.
 Square Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 SurveyMonkey Inc., San Mateo, CA.
 Symantec Corp., Mountain View, CA.
 Synchrony, Stamford, CT.
 Takeda Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., Deerfield, IL.
 Target Corp., Minneapolis, MN.
 Tech Data Corp., Clearwater, FL.
 TIAA, New York, NY.
 T-Mobile USA Inc., Bellevue, WA.
 TPG Global LLC, Fort Worth, TX.
 TransUnion, Chicago, IL.
 Turner Construction Co., New York, NY.
 Twitter Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 U.S. Bancorp, Minneapolis, MN.
 Uber Technologies Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Ultimate Software, Weston, FL.
 Under Armour Inc., Baltimore, MD.
 Unilever, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
 United Airlines, Chicago, IL.
 United Parcel Service Inc., Atlanta, GA.
 Univision Communications Inc., New York, NY.
 Verizon Communications Inc., New York, NY.
 Visa, Foster City, CA.
 Warby Parker, New York, NY.
 WeddingWire Inc., Chevy Chase, MD.
 Wells Fargo & Co., San Francisco, CA.
 Whirlpool Corp., Benton Harbor, MI.
 Williams-Sonoma Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Workday Inc., Pleasanton, CA.
 Wyndham Hotels & Resorts Inc., Parsippany, NJ.
 Xerox Corp., Norwalk, CT.
 Yelp Inc., San Francisco, CA.
 Yext Inc., New York, NY.
 Zillow Group, Seattle, WA.
 Zimmer Biomet Holdings Inc., Warsaw, IN.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, today we will move forward on three pieces of legislation whose timely consideration is long overdue. We will move to protect Americans' access to health insurance; provide much-needed relief on prescription drug prices; provide Federal recognition to a Native American community; and at long last, pass the Equality Act, to remove the burden of discrimination and move us closer to a country where members of the LGBTQ community have an equal opportunity to achieve the American Dream.

The Equality Act will not be the end of our long journey towards full LGBTQ equality, but it will finally get

our laws in line with the values our country was founded upon. As was recognized in our founding documents, we must continually take steps to make our country more perfect.

Acknowledging in law the challenges facing LGBTQ people, and taking concrete action to correct them, brings us one step closer to that perfect union.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and the underlying legislation.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation and I commend once more the tireless work of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. CICILLINE.

I was proud to stand by him at its introduction, and championed it during our hearing on the matter in this committee, the first such hearing on the matter, for which I would also like to commend the Judiciary Committee Chairman, JERRY NADLER.

Much has changed in recent years about Americans’ attitude towards members of the LGBTQ community.

While Americans can be happy that we as a society have made strides in marriage equality, there is much work to do.

Despite significant legal advances over the past several years—including marriage equality, LGBTQ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis and too often have little recourse.

Fifty percent of the national LGBTQ community live in states where, though they have the right to marry, they have no explicit non-discrimination protections in other areas of daily life.

In most states, a same-sex couple can get married one day and legally denied service at a restaurant, be fired from their jobs or evicted from their apartment the next.

The Equality Act is historic legislation that says, unequivocally, that LGBTQ Americans deserve the full protections guaranteed by the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Equality Act extends anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans with regard to employment, education, access to credit, jury service, federal funding, housing, and public accommodations.

No American should ever be treated as less than equal in the eyes of the law.

The Equality Act will guarantee that LGBTQ Americans in Texas and across the country cannot be discriminated against because of who they are or whom they love.

It is long past time for this legislation to become law and that is why I proudly joined my colleagues today to get the job done.

In some areas, federal law prohibiting sex discrimination has already been properly interpreted by federal courts and administrative agencies to include discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Equality Act affirms these interpretations of existing law and makes the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity explicit, in order to provide greater clarity to members of the public, employers, schools, businesses and others.

In areas where sex discrimination is not already prohibited, the bill amends existing law to bar discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as sexual orientation and gender identity.

The need for this legislation is all the more urgent following recent news that the Supreme Court has granted a writ of Certiorari to a trio of three cases to test the reach of the Civil Rights act to determine if they cover gay and transgendered individuals.

With the political reality on the Court as it is, this body—the House of Representatives—owes it to our constituents to ensure that critical issues related to the civil rights of our fellow citizens are handled by their elected representatives, and not left to the whims of a re-constituted Trump Court demonstrably antagonistic towards the interests of minorities.

This is why the Equality Act has the bipartisan support of Members of Congress, the strong support of the business community, and the overwhelming support of the American people—with more than 7 in 10 supporting the Equality Act.

On behalf of LGBTQ Texans and all Americans, I am proud to be one of the original co-sponsors of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I look forward to voting YES when it comes to the House Floor, tomorrow and working towards full enactment.

With this critical legislation, we will finally, fully end discrimination against LGBTQ Americans, and move our nation closer to fulfilling the promise of equality, opportunity and justice for every American.

In the meanwhile, I support the rule governing debate of H.R. 5 and the underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 377

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 336) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment described in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in Section 4 is an amendment to H.R. 336 to add at the end of the bill the following:

“SEC. 406. CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON ESTABLISHING AN ENTERPRISE FUND FOR JORDAN

“For purposes of section 205(a), the term ‘establishment of the United States Development Finance Corporation’ means the end of the transition period, as defined in section 1461 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115–254).

“SEC. 407. FORM OF REPORT ON THE COOPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERING UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS

“The report required under section 123(d) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“SEC. 408. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WITHDRAWALS OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM SYRIA AND AFGHANISTAN

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) The foreign terrorist organization al Qaeda, responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001, maintains a presence in Afghanistan.

“(2) The Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham, better known by its acronym ISIS, flourished in the chaos unleashed by the civil war in Syria and at one point controlled extensive territory in Iraq and Syria.

“(3) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have murdered thousands of innocent civilians.

“(4) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have proven resilient and have regrouped when the United States and its partners have withdrawn from the fight against them.

“(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

“(1) acknowledges that the United States military and our partners have made significant progress in the campaign against al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham (ISIS), and honors the contributions and sacrifice of the members of the United States Armed Forces who have served on the front lines of this fight;

“(2) recognizes the continuing threat to the homeland and our allies posed by al Qaeda and ISIS, which maintain an ability to operate in Syria and Afghanistan;

“(3) expresses concern that Iran has supported the Taliban in Afghanistan and Hizballah and the Assad regime in Syria, and has sought to frustrate diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts in these two countries;

“(4) recognizes the positive role the United States and its partners have played in Syria and Afghanistan fighting terrorist groups, countering Iranian aggression, deterring the further use of chemical weapons, and protecting human rights;

“(5) warns that a precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from the ongoing fight against these groups, without effective, countervailing efforts to secure gains in Syria and Afghanistan, could allow terrorists to regroup, destabilize critical regions, and create vacuums that could be filled by Iran or Russia, to the detriment of United States interests and those of our allies;

“(6) recognizes that al Qaeda and ISIS pose a global threat, which merits increased international contributions to the counterterrorism, diplomatic, and stabilization efforts underway in Syria and Afghanistan;

“(7) recognizes that diplomatic efforts to secure peaceful, negotiated solutions to the conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan are necessary to long-term stability and counterterrorism efforts in the Middle East and South Asia;

“(8) acknowledges the progress made by Special Representative Khalilzad in his efforts to promote reconciliation in Afghanistan;

“(9) calls upon the Administration to conduct a thorough review of the military and diplomatic strategies in Syria and Afghanistan, including an assessment of the risk that withdrawal from those countries could strengthen the power and influence of Russia and Iran in the Middle East and South Asia and undermine diplomatic efforts toward negotiated, peaceful solutions;

“(10) requests that the Administration, as part of this review, solicit the views of Israel, our regional partners, and other key troop-contributing nations in the fight against al Qaeda and ISIS;

“(11) reiterates support for international diplomatic efforts to facilitate peaceful, negotiated resolutions to the ongoing conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan on terms that respect the rights of innocent civilians and deny safe havens to terrorists;

“(12) calls upon the Administration to pursue a strategy that sets the conditions for the long-term defeat of al Qaeda and ISIS, as well as the protection of regional partners and allies, while ensuring that Iran cannot dominate the region or threaten Israel;

“(13) encourages close collaboration between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch to ensure continuing strong, bipartisan support for United States military operations in Syria and Afghanistan; and

“(14) calls upon the Administration to certify that conditions have been met for the enduring defeat of al Qaeda and ISIS before initiating any significant withdrawal of United States forces from Syria or Afghanistan.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of military force.”.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 336.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—228

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

Levin (MI)	Panetta	Sires
Lewis	Pappas	Slotkin
Lieu, Ted	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Payne	Soto
Loeb sack	Perlmutter	Spanberger
Lofgren	Peters	Speier
Lowenthal	Peterson	Stanton
Lowe y	Phillips	Stevens
Luján	Pingree	Suozzi
Luria	Pocan	Takano
Lynch	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Malinowski	Pressley	Thompson (MS)
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Titus
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Tlaib
Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Tonko
Matsui	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)
McAdams	Rose (NY)	Torres Small
McBath	Rouda	(NM)
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Trahan
McEachin	Ruiz	Trone
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Underwood
McNerney	Rush	Van Drew
Meeks	Sánchez	Vargas
Meng	Sarbanes	Veasey
Moore	Scanlon	Vela
Morelle	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Moulton	Schiff	Visclosky
Mucarsel-Powell	Schneider	Wasserman
Murphy	Schrader	Schultz
Nadler	Schrier	Scott (VA)
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Scott, David
Neal	Scott, David	Serrano
Neguse	Serrano	Sewell (AL)
O'Halleran	Shalala	Shalala
Ocasio-Cortez	Sherman	Sherrill
Omar	Sherrill	
Pallone		

NAYS—189

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

Williams	Womack	Yoho
Wilson (SC)	Woodall	Young
Wittman	Wright	Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Richmond

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Aderholt	Johnson (LA)	Ryan
Brooks (IN)	Keating	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Norcross	
Davis, Rodney	Pence	

□ 1341

Messrs. TURNER, PALAZZO, MULLIN, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. BUSTOS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. RICHMOND changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—229

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

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

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Cummings	Higgins (LA)

Johnson (LA)	Ryan	Walker
Pence	Swalwell (CA)	Weber (TX)
Roby	Thompson (PA)	

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. DeLAURO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-62) on the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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, 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. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, lives are literally hanging in the balance. I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

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.

REAFFIRMING AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE LAND INTO TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 375) to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 375

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY REAFFIRMED.

(a) REAFFIRMATION.—Section 19 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”; 25 U.S.C. 5129), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “The term” and inserting “Effective beginning on June 18, 1934, the term”; and

(B) by striking “any recognized Indian tribe now under Federal jurisdiction” and inserting “any federally recognized Indian Tribe”; and

(2) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “In said sections, the term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”; 25 U.S.C. 5129), on the date of the enactment of that Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, 10 years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is known as the Carcieri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that trust land acquisition under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, up until 2009, the Department of the Interior, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, had consistently construed that the IRA authorizes the placement of land into trust for any Tribe so long as the Tribe is federally recognized at the time of the trust application.

The decision overturned 75 years of agency practice, both Democratic and Republican administrations, and created a two-tiered system for trust land acquisition. This also opened up the Tribes to frivolous lawsuits on land

that they had held in trust for years, sometimes decades.

While this has been great for lawyers and their firms, it is detrimental to the health of a Tribe. The money to defend these lawsuits could, instead, be used to provide and improve the lives of their members.

We have had to pass standalone bills for individual Tribes on a piecemeal basis to protect their lands, and we should, since these Tribal lands are under direct assault right now. We must also address this going forward so that other Tribes do not find themselves in the same dire straits.

Passage of H.R. 375 will restore clarity and stability for all federally recognized Tribes by ensuring they are all treated equally, regardless of date of recognition.

Let's not forget history and the decimation of Tribes and their homeland by the hand of the Federal Government. It has taken almost a century for us to even attempt to undo the damage we inflicted upon the indigenous peoples of this Nation.

This work is not complete. We are still federally acknowledging Tribes to this day. We are still striving to return merely a portion of the land back to Tribes. To say that Tribes that were recognized after 1934 are somehow inferior to Tribes that were recognized by 1934 is dangerously ignorant of history.

H.R. 375, introduced by Representative COLE of Oklahoma, is short, simple, and to the point. It will amend the IRA to ensure that all federally recognized Tribes are treated equally, regardless of their date of recognition.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member, for yielding time.

I want to thank both my friends, the chairman and the ranking member, for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor. It could not have happened without both of their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 375, legislation that would amend the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes.

Between the passage of the Dawes Act in 1887 and the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, the Indian landmass in the United States shrank by 86 million acres.

□ 1400

Since the enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act, the Department of the Interior has taken back approximately 9 million acres of land into trust status. Tribes have used their trust lands to build community facilities such as schools, health centers, and housing that serve their Tribal members. This land is also used for

Tribal enterprises and promotes economic development in communities that are often underserved and poverty-stricken.

In 2009, the Supreme Court of the United States overturned long-existing precedent in its decision on the *Carcieri v. Salazar* case. The Supreme Court ruled specifically that the Secretary's authority to hold land in trust under the Indian Reorganization Act was limited only to recognized Tribes "now under Federal jurisdiction," with the word "now" meaning June 18, 1934, the date of the enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act.

Previously, lower courts have viewed the word "now" as the instant when the Secretary invoked trust acquisition authority. However, the Supreme Court reversed the lower court ruling on the interpretation that the term "now under Federal jurisdiction" in section 19 of the Indian Reorganization Act was to be interpreted. It found that the phrase refers only to those Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction of the United States when the Indian Reorganization Act was enacted in 1934.

As a result of the *Carcieri* decision, the Secretary of the Interior may no longer use the Indian Reorganization Act to acquire trust land for any post-1934 Tribe without specific authorization from Congress. Because the Secretary has acquired lands in trust for dozens of Tribes recognized after 1934, the *Carcieri* ruling calls into question the validity of the trust status of such lands and jeopardizes their immunity from State and local taxation and regulatory jurisdiction.

Many Tribes have been forced into court to defend the status of their trust land, costing them millions of dollars and compromising their investments and jurisdiction.

H.R. 375 would amend the Indian Reorganization Act and clarify the language the Supreme Court ruled against by striking "the term," which I have previously referenced, and inserting the words "effective beginning on June 18, 1934, the term." It would also amend the statute language from "any recognized Indian Tribe now under Federal jurisdiction" to "any federally recognized Indian Tribe."

The modest changes clarify that the Secretary does have authority to take land into trust for any Tribe that the Federal Government has recognized.

As a member of the Chickasaw Nation and co-chair of the Native American Caucus, I commend the Natural Resources Committee for favorably marking up this legislation and this body for moving forward with the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 375.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, first of all, if the gentleman from Arizona has any speakers. I do have several.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, we have one speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be here. I also appreciate Mr. COLE for his work on this particular issue and the time he has put in over the last decade in trying to find a *Carcieri* fix.

That 2009 Supreme Court made the decision, but it actually opened up more questions than it provided solutions and answers in the process.

In the years since that decision, the Democrats, when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, did not find a solution. Republicans, when we were in the same situation, didn't find a solution either, probably because there is even a bigger question than what was decided in this particular case. That bigger question is one that is extremely complex and grave, and it indicates the complexity of this particular issue.

Lands taken into trust by Tribes definitely have a benefit and an advantage to the Tribe, but it also has an impact on the counties and local governments where this trust issue is taking place.

Let's be clear that, prior to *Carcieri*, the fee-to-trust process was broken and fraught with conflicts. In fact, many will still argue that even today, the current Bureau of Indian Affairs process provides very limited incentives for any community or stakeholder to be partners in this process. As a result, we are often left with conflict and political turmoil and accusations and re-creations on the local level.

Some areas of local government, especially the California State Association of Counties, have been repeatedly asking us to try to come up with a reform to the overall process because the process impacts taxes and zoning in communities where these trust lands are acquired.

Local governments, States, and stakeholders who have some kind of role to play in this area, should they have a seat at the table? Should they be consulted? Should they have some kind of input? Yes, obviously.

Should they have a veto in the process? I don't think so.

Where we draw that line to ensure that there is consultation, so you ensure that people have a voice in the process, that is the underlying question. That is the complex question.

During markup of this bill, Mr. HUFFMAN from California and Mr. GOSAR from Arizona entered into a colloquy. They actually had a discussion, one of the few times a committee did what a committee is supposed to do, talking about the need to come up with some kind of variance to this underlying issue that is not necessarily the crux of the 2009 decision. But how do we come up with this process?

If this bill is going to go all the way to the Senate and ultimately become law, we need some help in finding a solution to the bigger issue of how much

consultation should take place and who should have their voices heard in the overall process, a process that does not happen right now.

There is a pathway to solve these problems. We can address Carcieri or we can move forward to prevent future litigation that has plagued the land-in-trust process. The Tribes and every stakeholder in this process deserve as much.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0), my colleague and chair of the Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 375 introduced by my friend Representative COLE from Oklahoma.

H.R. 375 is a simple, straightforward fix to a problem that has caused chaos and uncertainty in Indian Country for a decade.

Ten years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is now known as the Carcieri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that eligibility for trust land acquisition under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were federally recognized as of 1934.

The acquisition of trust land for the benefit of Indian Tribes is absolutely essential to Tribal self-determination, economic development, and protection of Tribal homelands. The Carcieri decision created an unfair, impractical, two-tiered system for Tribes that wanted to engage in this essential function of Tribal sovereignty.

H.R. 375 simply amends the IRA to ensure that all federally recognized Tribes are treated equally, regardless of the date of recognition.

The Carcieri decision and its consequences harken back to the Federal Government's shameful history of oppression in Native communities. The decimation of Tribes and their homeland by the Federal Government is well documented. For centuries, we ignored their treaties and systematically stripped them of their land. It has taken almost a century for us to even begin to undo the damage we have inflicted on indigenous peoples.

Mr. Speaker, that work is nowhere near done. To this day, we are still federally recognizing tribes that the government tried to destroy. We are still striving to return merely a small portion of ancestral land back to Tribes so they can have homelands to call their own.

In order to continue to undo the harm we have done, we must end this system of haves and have-nots for trust land acquisition. We must level the playing field and alleviate the catastrophic consequences this decision has had in Indian Country.

We must pass H.R. 375, the clean Carcieri fix. If we do not, this administration will continue to strip trust

land from Tribes like the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which is the subject of another bill on the floor today. Tribes will continue to suffer needlessly, once again at the hands of the Federal Government.

Indian Country has been clamoring for this clean, simple fix for a decade, and we cannot make them wait any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the current form of H.R. 375.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, or IGRA, with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes' original reservations. H.R. 375 reverses a major 2009 Supreme Court decision, and the bill would lead to future abuses of IGRA.

The bill gives unelected bureaucrats a blank check to take any land in trust without respect for impacted communities, including other Tribes. More importantly, H.R. 375 allows reservation shopping and for lands to be taken into trust for off-reservation casinos in places where States, local governments, and other Tribes oppose such action.

H.R. 375 will result in a flood of new off-reservation casinos that cause harm to States and local communities. Many of these casino locations that are nowhere near Tribes' historic reservations will be handpicked by gambling investors and Washington bureaucrats.

If H.R. 375 passes, all Tribes would have to do in order to get land taken into trust and open off-reservation casinos is to show that they are federally recognized by the Department of the Interior.

In the Natural Resources Committee markup of this bill, the gentleman from the Second District of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, and I engaged in a productive debate on this bill. We both agreed to try to find common ground on which to respond to my concerns about off-reservation casino abuse and the valid concerns brought to the committee by State and county governments. Bringing H.R. 375 up via suspension this week and not allowing any amendments prohibits us from making good on that agreement.

H.R. 375 should have been amended prior to being brought to the floor to address these bipartisan concerns.

Taking land into trust divests the affected State and local governments of jurisdiction. When land is taken into trust, for example, the Tribe will not pay any applicable taxes on the land, but the county or city in which the land is located might nonetheless be required to supply the Tribe with county and city services, and non-Tribal residents will pay for it. At least consultation should be a minimum.

The bill as currently drafted therefore increases the power of an unelected bureaucracy to divest non-consenting State and local governments of jurisdiction over their land. This, by itself, is a great cause of concern.

Let's be clear about H.R. 375 and how a bill of this scope and magnitude deserves more careful consideration than is being given here today.

Currently, there are almost 600 recognized Tribes in the United States, about 240 of which have gaming operations. H.R. 375 removes the dam that provided some restraint on the number of Tribal casinos and would be a dramatic departure from existing Federal law that has been in place for almost a century.

Before voting on this bill, I hope Members all understand that H.R. 375 will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States. If H.R. 375 passes, all federally recognized Tribes will be eligible to receive land in trust and potentially open off-reservation casinos. This includes any Tribe recognized by the Department of the Interior that was ineligible to receive land in trust and/or was denied land in trust prior to H.R. 375.

According to the National Indian Gaming Commission fact sheet, as of 2016, approximately 329, or 58 percent, of the recognized Tribes had no gaming operations.

President Trump opposes H.R. 312 and with good reason. That bill gives land in trust and a casino to a single Tribe that is otherwise ineligible to receive those benefits, as well as reverses Federal court and Interior decisions. But H.R. 375 does all that and more.

Instead of giving land in trust to only one Tribe, it lets an unelected bureaucracy give whatever land it wants to all recognized Tribes. Thus, the same concerns that exist with respect to H.R. 312, which we will be talking later about, exist at an even greater level with respect to H.R. 375.

The purpose of considering bills under suspension is to dispose of non-controversial measures expeditiously, but H.R. 375 has controversy written all over it.

H.R. 375 has ridden alongside H.R. 312 largely unnoticed, and no one has pointed out two crucial facts: one, that it exists as a contingency plan in case its sister bill, H.R. 312, fails; and two, that its effect would be national rather than local.

H.R. 375 and H.R. 312 are two heads of the same snake, one large, one small. Senator WARREN, regardless, will get her casino if either bill passes.

□ 1415

Further, passage of H.R. 375 will allow for new off-reservation casinos to be opened in your States and communities and for land to be ripped away from local jurisdictions without recourse.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for the opportunity to

speak on this important issue. I urge all Members to vote “no” on H.R. 375. Send it back to get consultation, at least, put in.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his assistance, for his leadership on this important issue, and for the time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has been 10 years in the making for Indian Country. A decade ago, a Supreme Court ruling created unnecessary confusion in the interpretation and application of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.

This bill, H.R. 375, would clarify the ensuing confusion. Among other things, it would ensure the IRA applies to all Native American Tribes recognized by the Federal Government, regardless of their date of recognition.

For the last 10 years, the unnecessary confusion has caused uncertainty for Tribes seeking recognition and recognized lands, has halted economic development projects on Tribal lands, and has resulted in costly and protracted litigation.

Members and staff on both sides of the aisle deserve significant recognition for getting us to where we are today. But, in particular, Chairman GRIJALVA, Representative MCCOLLUM, and Representative COLE have been extraordinary. I thank them for their incredible leadership on Tribal issues, and their perseverance in pursuing a clean *Carcieri* fix.

I am honored to have the opportunity to speak on this. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

If we, indeed, are going to be serious about a legislative solution to *Carcieri*, then we need to work out some kind of compromise that could pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President.

I have been encouraged by the debate not only on the floor here, but also in our committee, regarding the need to consult with affected parties before land is taken into trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Mr. GRIJALVA whether he will commit to work with us on this type of legislation to solve this underlying problem as this bill moves forward?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, when a Tribe applies to have land taken into trust through the Department of the Interior, local concerns are already strongly considered, even more so when the land is located away from existing reservation lands.

However, I do recognize there is a desire from some Members on both sides

of the aisle to work on stand-alone legislation that would codify some of the process.

I agree with the gentleman's statement about veto abilities. Any provision which would give counties or local governments veto power over trust land decisions is, frankly, a nonstarter. Local input is vital to these decisions and should be taken into account. However, Tribal consultation is solely the responsibility of the Federal Government, as is any final decision on transferring land into trust.

And I think because of the national implications of the question of trust land and the role that communities, i.e., counties and municipalities, would play, I think there is a need to somehow accommodate a level of Tribal consultation, because they are going to be the most affected party by any decision that is made.

With that said, I do commit, Mr. Speaker, to looking at any proposal on the issue and to work moving forward if it is to the betterment of all the stakeholders and I would assist the legislation in its final passage.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's commitment and I appreciate the comments that he will be there.

There is this bigger question that needs to be answered. Where we draw the line is a matter that still needs some kind of discussion, I recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a brilliant letter from me to Chairman GRIJALVA on this particular issue.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is frustrating that the Democrat Leadership has scheduled H.R. 375, legislation to reverse *Carcieri v. Salazar*, under suspension one week after the committee markup of the bill. It disregards what I believe was a bipartisan agreement to work on an amendment to the bill to improve consultation between the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and states and counties to mitigate the impacts of taking land in trust in their jurisdictions. The *Carcieri* decision created vast uncertainty over the fee-to-trust process for tribes and impacted stakeholders. I voted for H.R. 375 in committee as a display of my support for resolving *Carcieri*. My support for the bill's advancement is contingent upon the inclusion of reasonable safeguards on BIA's powers.

During markup on H.R. 375, Messrs. Huffman and Gosar discussed a mutual, bipartisan desire to respond to long-standing state and local concerns. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC), in a letter submitted for the markup record, reiterated the counties' "longstanding, valid concerns" they have with a fee-to-trust process conducted under a "fundamentally flawed regulatory framework" and they also submitted proposals to resolve these problems. I can attest that many counties in Utah share these same concerns.

Mr. Huffman explained that he found himself in partial agreement with CSAC's position, and that there should be "meaningful

good faith consultation" with local governments. While saying the Gosar amendment went too far, Mr. Huffman expressed a willingness to "continue collaborating on this issue" to "come up with something that would at least codify that good faith consultation part of a better process."

Bringing the bill to the Floor this Wednesday is not a sign that such collaboration is being taken seriously by Democrat Leadership nor is it a pragmatic approach to resolving *Carcieri* for the benefit of Indian Country.

The fee-to-trust system is broken because of a provision of a 1934 law that has not been updated since that law's enactment. Realistically, H.R. 375 offers an opportunity through which to fix it. Moving forward without reasonable consultation safeguards on BIA's authority will undermine successful resolution of *Carcieri*.

It was our hope that after debate on the bill during markup you'd allow Messrs. Huffman and Gosar, and other interested Members (on and off the Committee), an opportunity to explore solutions with H.R. 375's sponsor, Mr. Tom Cole. We need to work on a compromise bill that solves the underlying issues and can become law.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the *Carcieri* decision has caused anxiety and confusion in Indian Country, creating dangerous legal ambiguities related to Indian trust lands.

Today, we can finally end all that. We can remove the ambiguity and uncertainty, and finally offer Tribal nations peace of mind that their lands are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of H.R. 375, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUIZ). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 375.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 377, I call up the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 312

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 “Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act”.

SEC. 2. REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The taking of land into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe of Massachusetts as described in the final Notice of Reservation Proclamation (81 Fed. Reg. 948; January 8, 2016) is reaffirmed as trust land and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) *APPLICATION.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action (including an action pending in a Federal court as of the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the land described in subsection (a) shall not be filed or maintained in a Federal court and shall be promptly dismissed.

(c) *APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.*—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian Tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)), shall be applicable to the Tribe and Tribal members, except that to the extent such laws and regulations are inconsistent with the terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement, dated April 22, 2008, by and between the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe and the Town of Mashpee, Massachusetts, the terms of that Intergovernmental Agreement shall control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 312.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, will reaffirm the trust status of Mashpee's Tribal land and protect the Tribe from further attacks on its land and its sovereignty.

The Mashpee relationship with the Federal Government is one of the oldest in the United States. In fact, their ancestors are the ones who welcomed the pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock, as well as the people who aided those pilgrims through hard times in 1621, in what we now refer to as the “First Thanksgiving.”

Like many Tribes, the Mashpee were intentionally and systematically rendered landless, through no fault of

their own. They fought long and hard over the years to reestablish both their Tribe and their land base.

The Tribe first petitioned the Federal Government for recognition in 1978. Finally, after 30 years, the Bush administration extended formal recognition to the Tribe in 2007. However, they still remained landless.

This was remedied in 2015, when the Department of the Interior took approximately 320 acres into trust to serve as the Tribe's reservation lands. The two parcels that compose the 320 acres are both within the Tribe's historic and ancestral homelands.

The Tribe constructed a government center on the land, which includes their schools, courtrooms and multipurpose room, as well as a medical clinic facility. And they broke ground on a gaming facility that would eventually bring in much-needed revenue for Tribal operations and programs.

However, in 2016, a group of Taunton residents, backed by an out-of-state commercial gaming company, filed a Carciere suit in federal court to challenge the Department of the Interior's action.

Initially, the executive branch defended the decision to create the Mashpee reservation. However, in May 2017, the Department of Justice, under the Trump administration, inexplicably withdrew from the litigation and is no longer defending the status of the Tribe's land.

Then, in September 2018, the Department of the Interior issued its first Carciere decision in which it refused to reaffirm its own authority to confirm the status of the Tribe's lands into trust. The effect of this decision cannot be overstated. For the first time in this century, a Tribe was stripped of its sovereign rights to its land. It would mark the first time since the dark days of the termination era that the United States acted to disestablish an Indian reservation and render a Tribe landless.

These attacks on the reservation and on the Tribe's very status have been devastating. The legal uncertainty that has been imposed by these events is forcing the Tribe to borrow thousands of dollars every day just to keep its government running, resulting in devastating cuts to essential services, and massive layoffs of Tribal members.

This is completely unacceptable. We cannot idly stand by as Tribal people are once again harmed by yet another action by the Federal Government. Let's be honest, the Federal Government has done a terrible job of living up to its moral and legal obligations to Indian Country.

Housing, education, healthcare, and basic needs often go unmet in Tribal lands. These are not extras or handouts to Tribal people. It is part of a trust responsibility, enshrined in numerous treaties, court rulings, and laws.

But the needs still need to be met, despite the Federal Government's failings. So how do Tribes attempt to

make up for that shortfall? By utilizing their land for economic development, including gaming.

Economic development on Tribal lands is vital to the prosperity of a Tribe and the ultimate goal of self-determination and self-reliance. We have seen it numerous times across the Nation: Tribes using those dollars to fund their programs, construct housing and health clinics, and take care of the needs of their people.

The Mashpee Tribe should not be hindered from economic development on their land solely because the State of Rhode Island wants to protect its own State-run gaming interest.

H.R. 312 is widely supported in Indian Country, with letters of support from over 50 individual Tribes and pan-Tribal organizations.

Additionally, the bill has strong support, including from the cities of Taunton and Mashpee, the Chambers of Commerce of both cities, the State of Massachusetts, numerous Members of the Massachusetts State House and State Senate, the Mayflower Society, and many local businesses and business leaders.

Passage of H.R. 312 will protect the Mashpee Tribe's reservation lands and make clear that the Tribe is entitled to be treated the same way as other federally recognized Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in strong opposition to H.R. 312.

H.R. 312 is contrary to the view of the Department of the Interior. It contradicts a Supreme Court decision and aims to reverse Federal court decisions on this matter in order to build a massive 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation gaming complex for the benefit of Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company.

H.R. 312 creates two reservations for the Mashpee Tribe of Massachusetts:

One reservation will be the town of Mashpee, the Tribe's historic reservation lands. No casino will be allowed within the geographical boundaries of the town of Mashpee.

The other reservation is, oddly, 50 miles away from Mashpee, in the city of Taunton. This site is not part of the Tribe's historic reservation and was selected by the Tribe and Genting for a billion-dollar casino project because of its proximity to the Providence, Rhode Island, casino market, 20 miles distant.

There is no reason for the second reservation, other than to build an off-reservation casino 50 miles away from the Mashpee Tribe, where they currently reside. In fact, the new off-reservation casino will be only 20 miles from the New England Patriots' football stadium and, again, 50 miles from the Mashpees' historic reservation.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes' original reservations. By placing land in

trust for the Mashpee Tribe for gaming in Taunton, H.R. 312 creates an off-reservation casino, which is inconsistent with congressional intent. This is often called reservation shopping, and it is an abuse of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Tribe's lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the bureaucrats within the BIA to obtain the two reservations through administrative action. RedState recently reported:

No one is more desperate for H.R. 312 to succeed than Genting Malaysia. If the casino doesn't come through, the Tribe doesn't have to pay Genting back the over half a billion dollars it borrowed.

H.R. 312 is a financial bailout for Genting. The Tribe is swamped with a \$500 million-plus debt to Genting, and there is no way the Tribe can ever pay this back and still make enough money to sustain itself. Genting, therefore, will be the real owner of the project, not the Tribe.

This kind of arrangement where the creditor practically controls the financial future of a debtor Tribe is contrary to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which requires every Tribal casino to be 100 percent tribally owned.

At the committee hearing on this bill, counsel for the Governor of Rhode Island testified that H.R. 312 will cause the State significant harm with regards to revenues for education, infrastructure, and social programs and is contrary to the limitations contained in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

Moreover, the American Principles Project also reported on the ties between convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, stating:

The expansive Abramoff investigation uncovered major corruption within the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe. Its chief, Glenn Marshall, pled guilty in 2009 to multiple Federal charges, including embezzling Tribal funds and campaign finance violations committed while working with Abramoff to secure the Federal recognition of the Tribe in 2007.

For my Republican colleagues: The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans during the committee markup, including the ranking member, ROB BISHOP; President Trump tweeted that he opposed the bill and urged Republicans to do the same; House Minority Whip STEVE SCALISE also sent an email recommending Members vote "no" on H.R. 312. Do you really want to vote for ELIZABETH WARREN's top Tribal priority?

For my Democratic colleagues: Representatives CICILLINE and LANGEVIN strongly oppose this bill, and it is opposed by the Democratic Governor of Rhode Island. The bill is also "strenuously opposed" by other federally recognized Tribes in Massachusetts.

For Members on both sides of the aisle: Do you really want your name tied to a Tribe that only received Federal recognition in 2007 as a result of shady lobbying by Jack Abramoff? Do you really want to vote for a \$500 million bailout for a former gaming corporation?

In short, H.R. 312 authorizes an off-reservation casino, bails out a foreign corporation from major financial problems of its own making, reverses the judgment of a Federal court, and contradicts the Supreme Court ruling.

Wow, all in one breath.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to vote against H.R. 312, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for all his hard work on this bill and so many others that are related to this.

I also want to thank the Natural Resources subcommittee chair and ranking member, Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. COOK.

I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts who has worked so hard and is a cosponsor, Mr. KENNEDY.

I also want to give particular thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his support and also voice my strong support for H.R. 375, the bill that was just debated that is well thought out, well worked through—over a decade—and well worth the support of everyone here.

Mr. Speaker, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe has resided in southern New England for more than 12,000 years. To not have their land federally recognized is simply a disgrace.

We have seen them in our history books, in historical paintings, in iconic murals. They are the Tribes that welcomed the Pilgrims for the first Thanksgiving. This President even put them in his own Thanksgiving proclamation just last year. He recognized them.

Tragically, like so many Native Americans, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe has lived through centuries of injustice, the latest of which this House is debating today.

For years, I have worked personally with the Tribe as they have used hard-earned Federal recognition to provide adequate housing, jobs, job training, and essential services, including native language learning, early childhood education.

And this is important. We all know, in my region, the plague of the opioid epidemic, through Cape Cod, in that region. The incidence of overdose for the Wampanoag Tribe is 400 times. I will repeat that, 400 times more, the number of overdoses for that Tribe. I have worked with them and will continue to work with them, if they are in existence, to try and help them deal with this scourge.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe is also a Tribe that, as you look at the landscape for Tribes around the country, is suffering so many things that other Tribes are—the uncertainty of their status.

And this is the Tribe, I think, that best shows the inequities that are involved in these types of recognition.

I will just say, I introduced this bill last Congress when we first heard rumors that the Department of the Interior was going to, for the first time, reverse the position of the previous administration and refuse to defend the Mashpee Wampanoag's right to their historic land. They are the only Tribe that has received recognition and then had it taken away from them.

Now the Tribe's reservation is hanging by a thread, and they have been left to defend their land on their own. This is an existential threat.

Without support from Congress, it will be nearly impossible for the Mashpee to engage in any kind of true self-government because they won't own their own land: no economic development, no Tribal headquarters, no elder housing, no pre-K programs. It means being treated as a second-class Tribe with no future.

Bipartisan legislation to help a Tribe like the Mashpee would normally pass the House without issue. Just 2 weeks ago, we passed a parallel Republican-led bill for a Tribe in California without a single Member objecting—not a peep from the other side. President Obama signed a bill like this into law in 2014, and, importantly, President Trump did the same just last year.

Sadly, although the substance of H.R. 312 is noncontroversial, the tactics employed by the bill's few opponents are not. Throughout this process, we have seen gross mischaracterization and outright lying for personal and financial gain.

My Republican colleague, ranking member in the Rules Committee, a member of the Chickasaw Nation, a Republican from Oklahoma and an expert on these issues, said last night at the Rules meeting, never has he seen such misinformation about a simple bill, to the point of being scurrilous.

This is not about gaming. It is not about picking winners and losers. It is simply about a Tribe's rightful place in its native land. That is all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the best in this institution. I believe that many of us in Congress are here to lead. We are here to debate issues on their merits; we are here to find common ground when we might otherwise disagree; and we are here to set an example to show the American people what is right. Yet what we have seen happen to the Mashpee bill in the past week reflects the worst. No low seems too low.

Where is the bottom?

We have seen the President, through his tweets, trying to sink an entire Native American Tribe in the name of special interests, dirty lobbying, and outright bigotry.

The cast of characters behind the scenes spewing information is revealing: a rightwing lobbyist, Trump loyalist; a Trump campaign operative who worked for convicted felon and Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort; individuals with financial interests that

are counter to the Tribe, including two former Trump Plaza Casino officials and a major financier with both casino and National Enquirer interests.

Cultural warfare to benefit bank accounts, corrupt intent for personal gain, all in the form of a racist tweet. And some Members of this body are eager to let him get away with it. But not me, not my cosponsors, and not the majority of this House.

I still believe this House has an opportunity today to do what is right. We can show the Native American people that we will stand up for them, that after nearly 250 years since our country's founding we would not be where we are without them. They deserve that dignity; they deserve that respect; and they deserve that sovereignty for their historic homeland.

Mr. Speaker, let's be on the right side of history today. Vote "yes" and save the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that my colleagues on the other side understand that, as the city of Mashpee, no one has any problems, but it is the city of Taunton that is part of the problem, and that is where we have the gist. So I caution them to watch their rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. It is a very generous gesture when we have a different point of view on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.

Mashpee Wampanoag people have lived in the Massachusetts area for thousands of years. In fact, our shared Thanksgiving tradition highlights a celebration of Pilgrims and Indians breaking bread together over the first colonial holiday, and it is the Mashpee who sat at the table.

In 2007, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe was federally recognized. Mr. Speaker, 8 years later, the Bureau of Indian Affairs approved the decision to take land into trust on behalf of the Mashpee for a reservation. The Tribe was then able to provide services directly to its citizens, become eligible for Federal programs, and explore economic opportunities.

Shortly after, in 2016, the Mashpee's reservation decision was challenged in court by plaintiffs stating that, because the Tribe was federally recognized after 1934, the Department of the Interior could not take land into trust on behalf of a Tribe. This decision stems from the 2009 Supreme Court decision, *Carcieri v. Salazar*. It is an example of why that law needs to be fixed.

In 2018, the administration issued a decision that would take the Mashpees' reservation out of trust. This marked

the first time since the termination era that a Tribe has lost their trust land.

Frankly, from my standpoint, Mr. Speaker, an attack on trust land anywhere threatens trust land everywhere, so I am very happy to be working with my good friend, Mr. KEATING, on H.R. 312. It is a bipartisan bill, and it is necessary. It will reaffirm the trust status of the Mashpee reservation.

The local elected officials with jurisdiction over the land are supportive of the bill, as is the State's entire congressional delegation, as is the Republican Governor of the State.

Mr. Speaker, a "yes" vote on this bill will right a wrong. It is a vote for local control. It is a vote for Tribal sovereignty, and it brings the Mashpee land back into trust. It marks another important step in our shared American journey.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill.

□ 1445

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This bill will allow the Mashpee Tribe to open a massive off-reservation casino right on the border of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, nearly 40 miles away from their historic Tribal lands in Cape Cod.

The Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe became federally recognized in 2007. Under the Indian Reorganization Act, the United States Department of the Interior is only allowed to take land into trust for Tribes recognized before 1934.

In 2009, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed this Federal standard in the *Carcieri v. Salazar* decision. In 2015, the U.S. Department of the Interior ignored the Indian Reorganization Act and the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling and took land into trust for the Mashpee Tribe.

A year later, the residents of Taunton, Massachusetts, sued and won in U.S. district court to stop the casino from being built in their town. The district court ruled that the Department of the Interior should not have taken land into trust for the Mashpee Tribe and instructed the Department to conduct a further review of the Tribe's eligibility.

After reviewing the Mashpee Tribe's application last year, the U.S. Department of the Interior rejected the Tribe's claim based on the finding that the Tribe was not under Federal jurisdiction in 1934, which meant the Department lacked authority under Federal law to take land into trust on their behalf.

Today's bill would reverse this final decision of the Federal court and the

Department of the Interior and disregard the U.S. Supreme Court precedent in allowing the Tribe to build an off-reservation casino in Taunton, Massachusetts.

If H.R. 312 passes today, it would be the first time—I repeat, the first time—Congress ever reversed a final Federal court ruling that determined a Tribe did not meet the Federal standard to have land taken into trust by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The impact of this bill would be disastrous and would open a floodgate for Tribes to come to Washington to hire the biggest lobbyists they can to get their carve-out from Congress.

Do we really want to go down this road? Does Congress want to be in the business of picking winners and losers? That is exactly what this bill does.

The Tribal land system shouldn't depend on which Tribes hire the most expensive lobbyists. Instead, it should be based on fairness under our law and applied equally.

Instead of this bill directly benefiting the Tribe, as some have suggested, the bill will bail out Genting, the Malaysian hedge fund that is financing this deal. Even if this bill passes today and the Mashpee build a casino, it is very unlikely, according to all the experts, that the Mashpee casino will ever be profitable for the Tribe because they owe Genting a half-billion dollars.

Proponents of this bill have argued that Congress is the last hope for the Mashpee Tribe and that they will go bankrupt without this casino, but Genting Malaysia has already written off the half-billion dollars it gave to the Tribe as a loss on its financial statements. If today's bill fails, the Mashpee Tribe does not need to pay back this money because, under the agreement with Genting, it is contingent on the casino being built. The debt is erased.

Regardless of what happens with this bill today, the Mashpee Tribe will still be a federally recognized Tribe and will continue to receive Federal benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I started off opposing this bill because of the damage it would do to Rhode Island's economy. The casino in Rhode Island generates over \$300 million in economic activity and is responsible for thousands of jobs in Rhode Island. I am very proud of my fierce defense for my State, and putting an off-reservation casino on the border will have a significant, negative impact on Rhode Island.

But the more I learned about this legislation, the more I realized the dangerous precedent this bill would set if it became law. H.R. 312 would reverse a Federal court ruling, undermine the Indian Reorganization Act, ignore a U.S. Supreme Court ruling, and reject the 2018 decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior. Most perniciously, it is a special deal for a single Tribe, and that is just wrong.

I stand here in opposition to this bill not only because of the impact on my

State, and not because I am unsympathetic to the challenges the Tribe faces, but this legislation will continue their exploitation by a powerful foreign entity.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island so that we may have a quick colloquy.

As the gentleman made mention, it was locals in Taunton that actually sued; is that true?

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. Does the gentleman think that the court in which they sued had any of the information skewed in front of it, in front of their jurisdiction?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am not aware of the information they had.

Mr. GOSAR. All this information that we are hearing, that is myth versus fact; is that true?

Mr. CICILLINE. Again, I don't know about the legal proceedings. I know that the litigation was begun by the people in the local community.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for engaging in the colloquy, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to address a point that was brought up during the debate on this bill, that the Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition if H.R. 312 does not pass. That is true. We have never stated the Federal recognition was in jeopardy.

What we are talking about, which is fundamental to the survival of the Tribe, is destroying a Tribe's sovereign government. That is really what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), another sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this critical piece of legislation forward and for shepherding it to the House floor today.

I thank my colleague and friend, Congressman KEATING, for his advocacy on behalf of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, which calls both of our districts home.

Nearly four centuries ago, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe opened their homes and their lands to the Pilgrims who sailed to our shores. That same welcoming spirit survives in their ancestors who live in Massachusetts today.

That is why I am proud to have the Wampanoag people call my district their home. They have planted their roots deeply in Massachusetts, and they see a future of self-determination and prosperity in the city of Taunton.

But I am ashamed of how our Nation has treated them in the 398 years since

they shared their precious resources with those strangers, not to mention the generations before them that called the region home for nearly 12,000 years.

I am ashamed of how our Nation has treated many Native people throughout our history and how we have taken their land, silenced their voices, poisoned their water, and disrupted their culture. We have dismissed their very humanity.

It is that shame that leaves us here today with a decision to make. Today, as this House debates this bill, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe is on the verge of dissolution. An unjust Supreme Court decision, followed by a reversal by the Department of the Interior to take the Tribe's land into trust, has left the Tribe with no other options. They are without access to critical Federal funds to support their public services, including health centers and schools.

The question today is, do we allow this to become a closing chapter in the story of an indigenous people who put their faith and trust into strangers? Do we allow a legal loophole to define American citizens out of existence?

Or do we begin to right the wrongs of our past? Do we begin to march down a path of justice and equality and hope for the Native people whose dreams for this country outlive our very democracy?

To me, that choice is simple. It is a matter of right and wrong, of correcting a historical injustice that has perpetrated for far too long. It would simply put the Mashpee Tribe on equal footing with all other federally recognized Native American Tribes.

I want to take a minute, Mr. Speaker, to rebut some of the arguments made by our colleagues.

One, that this is an off-reservation development: There is no reservation. There is nothing to be off-reservation. I cannot imagine that the argument actually is that, for a Tribe that called thousands of acres home, you are going to say they can only represent one small portion of that and not have two facilities. That can't possibly be how the U.S. Government is dictating what Tribal lands can be today of an area they called home for 12,000 years.

Two, my colleagues argued that this overrules a court decision. The last time I checked, that is what Congress does. We write laws. The courts interpret them. They strike down laws all the time. We write them again. That is in the Constitution. That is inherent in our responsibilities, in our obligation. The actual court decision, if you read it, indicates that Congress has the inherent power to do exactly what we are doing, 100 percent.

Three, our colleagues referenced the Gun Lake decision and the Gun Lake legislation. Gun Lake was a response to a decision by the Supreme Court as well, 100 percent.

We have heard allegations of lobbyists. The lobbyist for our colleagues in Rhode Island for their casinos is mar-

ried to a communications official in the White House. You can't possibly be saying that there is some issue here with Federal lobbying that is not directly and 100 percent in line with lining their own pockets for the opposition to this bill.

They said that the Tribe is about to go bankrupt. The Tribe is about to go bankrupt, but all of a sudden, the Tribe doesn't owe the financiers money. Which one is it?

Next, Federal benefits, they are saying that all the Federal benefits will remain. That ignores the Federal benefits that come with Federal recognition of reservations: the Indian Business Development Program, Financial Assistance and Social Services, employment assistance for adult Indians, vocational training for adult Indians, educational contracts under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, food distribution programs on the Indian reservation, Tribal transportation programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance Tribal justice system grants, treatment as a State under the Clean Water Act, treatment as a State under the Clean Air Act, exercise of Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction. All of those are contingent on this bill today.

A dangerous precedent is going to be set. The dangerous precedent that is going to be set is that Massachusetts residents legalized gambling. The Tribe went through a compact with the State that was approved. They went through a referendum with the people of Taunton that was approved nearly 60-40 that townspeople in Taunton want this bill. They want this development.

It is a billion dollars for a working-class community. The folks who don't are, yes, a few residents of that community whose lawsuit has been financed by a rival casino developer to end this project so they can build a different one down the road.

They say that this is too close to the Rhode Island border. There is an existing casino in Rhode Island that recently started 500 yards from the Massachusetts border. You cannot be serious about this.

There is no argument, other than greed, that comes back to why anyone should vote against this bill. This is about the recognition of a sovereign nation that welcomed strangers to their land 400 years ago and helped us celebrate our first Thanksgiving, and the ability of our Federal Government to recognize them for who they are. If nothing else, this Tribe deserves that.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I hope that I won't take the whole 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.

This bill will have enormous impacts on my home State of Rhode Island. The

intent of this bill is to allow for the construction of a new casino resort near the State line between Rhode Island and Massachusetts, which would rival the existing casinos in our State.

The Twin River Casino Hotel and the Tiverton Casino Hotel of Rhode Island generate \$300 million each year, representing the State's third largest source of funding. These dollars support vital education and infrastructure programs in Rhode Island. Rhode Island would suffer tremendously if H.R. 312 became law.

Beyond the economic damage that would occur to Rhode Island, the precedent that would be set by this bill is fundamentally unfair. The bill would overturn a 2018 decision by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and it would reverse a 2016 ruling by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

If Congress grants the Mashpee Tribe this exception, then other Native American Tribes would seek individual relief. Congress would be creating an unbalanced patchwork process for Tribes to put land into trust. Such a system would be based on lobbying, not on firm principles or deliberative rule-making.

□ 1500

The process to take Tribal lands into trust is complex and requires careful consideration of the interests of our indigenous peoples in conjunction with local communities. We know this complexity firsthand in Rhode Island, as the Supreme Court decision *Carcieri v. Salazar* directly concerned our State.

But the solution is to create a uniform standard for the whole country, not a haphazard process wherein Congress chooses winners and losers, again, based on lobbying. This is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. The bill creates evident harms to our State revenues in Rhode Island, but it also represents a slipshod way of addressing the very real issues of how Tribes have land taken into trust.

My friends in the Massachusetts delegation insist that this issue be handled with alacrity. I respectfully disagree. The urgency they express is grounded in the dollars and cents of gaming development, money loaned on the promise of casino riches. Those loans may have been imprudently granted, but we cannot allow imprudent financial dealings to force our hand.

Rather than rush a Tribe-specific loophole, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 312 and to, instead, update the Indian Reorganization Act to make this process more transparent and fair. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have been around here a little while, and I have never heard so many people from Arizona really concerned about anything that is going on in Rhode Island. For that matter, I haven't heard many people in Rhode Island that concerned about what is happening in Massachusetts.

But this is what it is about, I guess. It is not what it is about to me. It is not what it is about to our cosponsors. I know it is not what it is about to Mr. KENNEDY. I know it is not what it is about to the chairman of this committee.

I am puzzled. People are saying this is a circumvention dealing with gaming. This bill isn't about gaming. Let me bring it back into focus, but let me just address one thing first.

I am puzzled because this Tribe went through the State process. This wasn't a circumvention. They went through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' process for deciding gaming institutions. The State decided this. Congress isn't deciding this. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts decided this. They created an area in southeastern Massachusetts along with two other areas in the State where this would be located.

So I have got news for the people in Rhode Island: They can do their best to kill this bill and destroy this Tribe, but it is still going to get a casino because the State of Massachusetts said so.

So now that I am through just pointing out what this bill isn't about, let me just make the last point about what it is about.

It is about justice. It is about doing the right thing. It is about taking a Tribe that, through its whole history, has lost all of its land even though it did occupy that land where it is in Taunton, where it occupies it now.

This is about doing the right thing, and it is a disgrace in this Congress that politics, special interests, lobbying, and conflicts have taken over this debate. Let's do the right thing. This is part of our history. We wouldn't be here where we are without this Tribe. Let's respect that. Let's pass this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric coming from the other side is hot and heavy like I don't know what I am talking about with Native American Tribes when I have lived my whole life in association with Tribes. So let's get through some of the false myths that are out here that continually are being talked about.

Now, the myth is that Congress has done this for other Tribes, i.e., we have heard about the Gun Lake Tribe.

Fact: That is false. This will be the first time, as my colleague from Rhode Island said, that Congress would overturn a Federal Court decision where the court ruled that the Tribe did not

meet the Federal standard to have land taken into trust, a State-recognized Tribe.

Myth: The Tribe is facing extinction unless Congress acts.

That would be false. The Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition and will continue to receive Federal benefits and funding even if H.R. 312 does not pass. Further, if this is not solely about a casino, then my amendment should have been considered and adopted in committee. The amendment was a compromise that would have secured a reservation for the Mashpee for all purposes but not gaming.

Myth number three: H.R. 312 is not a casino giveaway nor a case of reservation shopping.

Fact: It is both. There is no reason for the second reservation other than to build an off-reservation casino 50 miles away from where the Mashpee Tribe currently resides. If this weren't solely about a casino, then my amendment would have also been adopted in committee.

Myth: The two tracts of land in the town of Mashpee and the city of Taunton both are sites within the Tribal historical territories. My colleague from Massachusetts actually alluded to this.

That would be false. The Mashpee Tribe will build a massive, 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation casino away from their Tribal land on the border. That would be Taunton, Rhode Island.

In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes' original reservations. By placing land in trust for gaming in Taunton 50 miles away from the Tribe's historic reservation—he also brought that point up, that it wasn't their traditional land—what Congress intended in the Gaming Regulatory Act would be severely harmed.

Myth: This bill has nothing to do with approving a specific casino project.

Fact: We actually heard it again from the other side. If that were the case, then my amendment would have been made in order and received votes or deemed adopted at the committee level. The amendment would have secured a reservation for the Mashpee Tribe for any nongaming purposes.

These may include, but not be limited to, the construction and operation of Tribal government facilities and infrastructure, housing, a hospital, a school and library, a museum, a community center, assisted living for Tribal elders, business development, natural resources management, the Tribe's exercising its government jurisdiction over Tribal members, and many other Tribal uses.

The next myth is that H.R. 312 is not a bailout.

H.R. 312 is not a bailout? In fact, the Malaysian hedge fund, Genting Malaysia, that is underwriting the casino—yes, underwriting this casino.

The Mashpee Tribe will not receive a penny of revenue from the casino for many years, if ever, because of the massive size of the \$500 million-plus debt they have incurred to Genting. Genting, therefore, will be the real owner of the project, not the Tribe.

This kind of arrangement where the creditor practically controls the financial future of a debtor Tribe is contrary to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which requires every Tribal casino to be 100 percent tribally owned.

The last myth: The Mashpee Tribe will go bankrupt if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Fact: The Mashpee Tribe will only be required to repay its debt to the Malaysian company underwriting the deal if H.R. 312 is enacted and the casino is approved.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill. I have heard a lot of rhetoric today about the role of Congress and the role of the administration in recognizing or not recognizing Tribal lands, Tribal governments, reservations, and the ability of Tribes to participate in whatever kind of economic development they so desire.

I have also heard a lot of talk and discussion. I am pleased to hear talk and discussion on this House floor about the need to make sure that Tribes are recognized, that Tribal sovereignty is recognized, and that this government needs to do right by Native people and indigenous people to this land.

But the basis for support of this bill today is not necessarily rooted in whether or not we are doing the "right thing." Congress has a duty to properly exercise our plenary power over interactions with Tribal people and with Tribal governments. The Constitution gives Congress plenary power over interactions with Indian Tribes. What is at stake here today is how Congress and the Federal Government are going to continue to interact with Indian Tribes.

Tribes don't need Congress Members' sympathy. What Tribes need is for us to properly exercise our duty. This bill does that. This bill exercises Congress' proper power to recognize a Tribe, to recognize Tribal reservation lands, and it has nothing to do with what happens afterwards.

This bill wouldn't abrogate or alter the application of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act or any other piece of legislation. This bill would simply do exactly what Congress' job is to do: recognize the Federal-Tribal relationship that exists and the Tribal lands that are properly held in trust and should be held in trust for an Indian Tribe. That is what we are doing right now.

All the talk and discussion about other pieces of legislation that might

be called into question after this bill is passed should be debated later. That has nothing to do with what this specific bill applies to.

Our role here is very simple. We have got to recognize the Mashpee Tribe's reservation. We have got to recognize their sovereignty and their self-determination.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to address Congress' intent, under article I, section 8.

As I said before, the Mashpee reservation of the city of Mashpee is not of consequence. It is the area outside of their previous homeland of Taunton that is of discussion. That is only the aspect here. What has happened here is the bypassing of protocol and law that actually causes the problem.

So let me give you a little bit of background about why I have this problem.

We had seen previous abuse in the past where the off-reservation land was taken in a trust against the will of States, compacts, and local communities for the sole purpose of building new casinos.

This was certainly the case of the Tohono O'odham Nation right in Arizona when they acted against the fellow Tribes, the State of Arizona, and the general public to open an off-reservation casino in Glendale, despite agreeing to a voter-approved compact not to build any more casinos in the Phoenix metro area until the compact was renegotiated. Litigation discovery and audio recordings affirm this shameful conspiracy implemented by the Tohono O'odham.

I am concerned that this bill as written will encourage future abuse in that regard and allow for more off-reservation casinos to be built against the objections of local communities.

Furthermore, there is no CBO score for this bill. There is no committee report that I have seen. We are pushing this bill through that has no chance of being signed into law without amendment and without knowing the full ramifications of this legislation.

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

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

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

Let's go back to some more of the myths.

The Mashpee Tribe will lose its Federal recognition and benefits if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Once again, that is false. The Mashpee Tribe will not lose its Federal recognition and will continue to receive Federal benefits and funding even if H.R. 312 does not pass.

Here is the next myth. It was the intent of Congress for all Tribes to have land and trust under the IRA of 1934 regardless of when the Tribes obtained Federal recognition.

Fact: That is not what the Supreme Court said in *Carcieri v. Salazar*. The

Supreme Court said that the Tribal aspect of the IRA of 1934 does not authorize the Secretary of the Interior to place land in trust for Tribes that were not under Federal jurisdiction on the date of enactment of IRA, or 1934.

Fact: There is no evidence that Congress, in 1934, thought that off-reservation gaming would turn into the controversial mess it has become today.

Myth: After a Federal judge struck down the Obama administration's second definition of Indian analysis, the Trump administration chose not to defend the decision.

Fact: The Trump administration chose not to defend the decision because the judge said it was "not even close," and the Obama administration had not used this analysis in any other Tribe's trust land case. It was used once only for the Mashpee. The Court remanded the matter back to Interior for an examination under the same "first definition of Indian" analysis used for all other Tribes.

In applying the Obama administration's analysis used for all other Tribes, the Trump administration determined the Mashpee did not qualify, and yet Tribes blame the Trump administration for something the Obama administration could have done years ago but chose not to.

□ 1515

Could the fate of a billion-dollar casino be the reason why the Obama administration bent the rules? I wonder.

H.R. 312 doesn't amend the IRA. It doesn't amend any law. Rather, H.R. 312 declares the Obama action struck down by the U.S. district court to be lawful and proper. The bill also orders the court to dismiss the lawsuit concerning the casino property and to prohibit the filing of any future lawsuit over it.

Mr. Speaker, we constantly see over and over again, the problem with H.R. 312 is it is once again being rushed to the floor.

I want to reference a letter from Eagle Forum and highlight, basically, their reservations.

"This bill is a deceptive plan to undermine the Federal Government's decision to deny the Mashpee Tribe land for a new casino. The Mashpee Tribe has previously engaged in questionable financial and lobbying dealings. They are currently \$450 billion in debt to Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company, because of this project.

"The Tribe has no way of paying the company back, which means Genting will be the true owner of this project. Taxpayers should not be responsible for the bailout of their irresponsible dealings."

Down further it goes:

"Just the issue of gambling alone has been devastating to families across the United States, especially among Native Americans."

Further down it goes:

"For these reasons, we urge you to vote 'no' on H.R. 312, Mashpee

Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act.”

I also want to reference Americans for Limited Government:

“The House of Representatives should reject H.R. 312, the Senator ELIZABETH WARREN-led attempt to punch piecemeal holes through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. This isn’t about the ability of Tribes using land that is part of their long-established heritage for casino development, but, instead, it is about whether Congress should place gambling institutions on unrelated land based upon proximity to urban areas.

“If Senator WARREN and her benefactors wish to change the Indian gaming laws, they should introduce wholesale reforms rather than turning the existing law into Swiss cheese for nothing more than investor pecuniary interests.

“Rick Manning, President, Americans for Limited Government.”

We actually have our opposition to 312:

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, when it comes before the House today.

H.R. 312 is contrary to the view of the Department of the Interior, contradicts a Supreme Court decision, and aims to reverse Federal court decisions on this matter in order to build a massive, 400,000-square-foot, off-reservation gaming complex for the benefit of Genting, a foreign Malaysian gaming company.

The bill forever strips the Federal Government of its jurisdictions over this Tribal casino and overturns a well-reasoned decision from a Federal judge.

H.R. 312 also provides a massive tax shelter for Genting by shielding the land—and the casino on it—from taxation and State regulation.

The bill creates two reservations for the Mashpee Tribe of Massachusetts, one reservation which we have no problem with, in the town of Mashpee, the Tribe’s historic reservation lands. No casino will be allowed within the geographical boundaries of the town of Mashpee.

The other reservation will be 50 miles away from Mashpee in the city of Taunton. This site is not part of the Tribe’s historic reservation and was selected by the Tribe and Genting for a billion-dollar casino project because of its proximity to the Providence, Rhode Island, casino market, 20 miles away.

In 1988, Congress enacted the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act with the intent to restrict casinos to Tribes’ original reservations.

By placing land in trust for gaming in Taunton, H.R. 312 creates an off-reservation casino, which is inconsistent with congressional intent. This is often called “reservation shopping,” and it is an abuse of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Tribe’s lawyers knew that reservation shopping was a political headache, so they went to the previous administration to obtain the two reservations through administrative action.

Once again, the Federal judge, however, ruled that what the previous administration did was unlawful, so now they need legislation to authorize this off-reservation casino.

The bill was opposed by 10 of the 13 voting Republicans in the committee markup. Ranking Member Rob Bishop was one of those. These Members are joined by Ameri-

cans for Limited Government, the American Principles Project, the Coalition for American Values, Eagle Forum, the Governor of Rhode Island, Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head, Congressman David Cicilline, Congressman James Langevin, and President Donald Trump in opposing this bill.

President Trump tweeted that he opposed the bill and urged Members of Congress to do the same last week. House Minority Whip Steve Scalise also sent an email recommending Members vote “no” on H.R. 312.

The bill is also strenuously opposed by the only other Federally-recognized Tribe in Massachusetts.

All of this opposition was enough to have the bill pulled from consideration by the House of Representatives under the suspension of the rules procedures one week after it was considered in committee with no bill report or score—actually, there was a bill report but no score from the Congressional Budgetary Office.

Now, the Democrat leadership is using a closed rule and not allowing any amendments to get this controversial bill out of the House of Representatives. Given that H.R. 312 authorizes an off-reservation casino, bails out a foreign corporation from major financial problems of its own making, and reverses the judgment of a Federal court and contradicts Interior and Supreme Court decisions, it is no wonder that the majority had to resort to these drastic measures.

I urge everyone to vote “no” and to oppose this bill that sets a dangerous precedent that will open the floodgates to off-reservation Tribal casinos all over the United States if enacted into law.

Once again, I want to reiterate, if you have a problem with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, let’s do the wholesale changes on a massive scale, not do it one piece at a time, one Tribe at a time, not allowing lawful actions to occur.

So, I ask all my colleagues to vote “no” against this bill. Send a clear message that we have got to follow the law or change it wholesale for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a “no” vote from my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Upholding the establishment of Tribal homelands should be, and is, one of the most important actions that this Congress can take. It is not just about tax-exempt status or economic development, both of which are vitally important to Tribal communities.

It is also about the construction of schools, housing, clinics, elder care facilities, things that are extremely vital to the quality of life and well-being of Tribal members.

It is also about recognizing a Tribe’s historical, cultural, and spiritual connection.

It is not about protecting a market share. It is not about the tweets from the President. It is not about the scare tactics and hysteria of off-reservation gaming that is constantly used in trying to fight the self-determination and the ability of Tribes to take care of themselves.

And it is about identity.

I want to just follow up on the gentlewoman from Kansas’ comment. To

ensure Tribal sovereignty and self-governance, land is critical to the connection of people to their land. And the real-world decisions that we are making have real consequences.

To strip people of their land is to strip them of their identity, to strip them of their self-governance and their self-determination. It is a sad state that, nearly 400 years later, the Mashpee still have to fight for land that is rightfully theirs.

But we can remedy that today.

I want to thank our colleagues Mr. KEATING and Mr. KENNEDY, as well as the entire Massachusetts delegation, for spearheading this effort to save the Mashpee’s land, preserve their way of life, and reestablish and not allow a precedent to stand where trust land that was given is taken away.

This is an important piece of legislation with implications across Indian Country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift adoption of H.R. 312, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter from the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah expressing their concerns about this legislation. I want to reiterate that I support this legislation. However, I believe it is important that the concerns of this sister tribe be included in this debate.

WAMPANOAG TRIBE OF
GAY HEAD AQUINNAH,
Aquinnah, MA.

To: The United States House of Representatives, Honorable Representatives

From: Chairwoman Cheryl Andrews-Maltais, The Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah (The Aquinnah Wampanoag)

Date: May 15, 2019

Re: H.R. 312

THE WAMPANOAG TRIBE OF GAY HEAD AQUINNAH (AQUINNAH WAMPANOAG TRIBE) STRENUOUSLY OPPOSES H.R. 312, MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT

The Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah (Aquinnah Wampanoag) strenuously opposes the above referenced Bill due to the fact that it creates two classes of Tribes within the same Wampanoag Tribal Nation.

H.R. 312 unfairly provides a pathway for economic development for one Tribe (the Mashpee Wampanoag) while simultaneously creating an obstruction to the other Wampanoag Tribe (the Aquinnah Wampanoag) whose Tribal community also lives within the same shared Ancestral territory of the Wampanoag Nation.

The Bill sets forth a pathway for one Tribe (the Mashpee) to acquire lands in trust outside of its original homeland “village site” of the Town of Mashpee and does not provide the same opportunity for the other Tribe (the Aquinnah).

H.R. 312 also removes all clouds of the applicability of the Indian Reorganization Act (as Amended), and all other laws enacted for the benefit of Federally Recognized Tribes for one Tribe (the Mashpee) and not for the Aquinnah who is of the same Wampanoag Nation and who was federally recognized 25 years earlier.

The Bill provides a remedy to the Department of the Interior’s (DOI’s) egregious determination that the Wampanoag are not eligible to have lands taken into trust for one Tribe (the Mashpee Wampanoag), while

omitting the other Wampanoag Tribe (the Aquinnah Wampanoag) from this remedy from which the Aquinnah Wampanoag are also suffering.

The Aquinnah Wampanoag would support this Bill, H.R. 312 if included as part of “and for other purposes”. The simple request is for a simple amendment to create fairness, equity and parity for both Wampanoag Tribes within Massachusetts.

SEC. (d) REAFFIRMATION OF INDIAN TRUST LAND TO ALSO INCLUDE THE WAMPAOAG TRIBE OF GAY HEAD AQUINNAH (THE AQUINNAH WAMPAOAG)

(a) IN GENERAL.—The taking of any land into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah of Massachusetts is reaffirmed as trust land and the actions of the Secretary of the Interior in taking that land into trust are ratified and confirmed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF LAWS.—All laws (including regulations) of the United States of general applicability to Indians or nations, Indian Tribes, or bands of Indians (including the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.)), shall be applicable to the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah and its Tribal members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 375; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1892.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 146, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—275

Adams	Calvert	Crist
Aguilar	Carbajal	Crow
Allred	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Amodel	Carson (IN)	Cunningham
Armstrong	Cartwright	Davids (KS)
Axne	Case	Davis (CA)
Babin	Casten (IL)	Davis, Danny K.
Bacon	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Barragán	Castro (TX)	Dean
Bass	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Beatty	Cisneros	DeGette
Bera	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bergman	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Beyer	Clay	Delgado
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Demings
Blumenauer	Cohen	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Cole	Deutch
Bonamici	Connolly	Diaz-Balart
Boyle, Brendan	Cook	Dingell
F.	Cooper	Doggett
Brindisi	Correa	Doyle, Michael
Brown (MD)	Costa	F.
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Duffy
Bustos	Cox (CA)	Engel
Butterfield	Craig	Escobar

Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard
Espallat	Lipinski	Ruiz
Evans	Loebach	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	Loftgren	Rush
Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Sánchez
Fitzpatrick	Lowe	Sarbanes
Fletcher	Lucas	Scanlon
Foster	Luján	Schakowsky
Frankel	Luria	Schiff
Fudge	Lynch	Schneider
Gabbard	Malinowski	Schrader
Gallego	Maloney,	Schrier
Garamendi	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
Garcia (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Scott, Austin
Garcia (TX)	Massie	Scott, David
Golden	Mast	Serrano
Gomez	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (OH)	McAdams	Shalala
Gonzalez (TX)	McBath	Sherman
Gottheimer	McClintock	Sherrill
Green (TX)	McCollum	Simpson
Grijalva	McEachin	Sires
Haaland	McGovern	Slotkin
Hagedorn	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Meeks	Soto
Hayes	Meng	Spanberger
Heck	Moolenaar	Speier
Higgins (NY)	Moore	Stanton
Hill (CA)	Morelle	Staubert
Himes	Moulton	Stefanik
Hollingsworth	Mucarsel-Powell	Stevens
Horn, Kendra S.	Mullin	Suozzi
Horsford	Murphy	Takano
Houlihan	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Neal	Thompson (PA)
Hurd (TX)	Neguse	Thornberry
Jackson Lee	Newhouse	Titus
Jayapal	Norcross	Tlaib
Jeffries	Nunes	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran	Torres (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres Small
Joyce (OH)	Omar	(NM)
Kaptur	Pallone	Trahan
Katko	Panetta	Trone
Keating	Pappas	Underwood
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Upton
Kennedy	Payne	Van Drew
Khanna	Perlmutter	Vargas
Kildee	Peters	Veasey
Kilmer	Peterson	Vela
Kim	Phillips	Velázquez
Kind	Pingree	Visclosky
King (NY)	Pocan	Walden
Kirkpatrick	Porter	Walorski
Krishnamoorthi	Pressley	Wasserman
Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)	Schultz
LaMalfa	Quigley	Waters
Lamb	Raskin	Watkins
Larsen (WA)	Reed	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Reschenthaler	Welch
Lawrence	Rice (NY)	Wexton
Lawson (FL)	Richmond	Wild
Lee (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (FL)
Lee (NV)	Rooney (FL)	Yarmuth
Levin (CA)	Rose (NY)	Young
Levin (MI)	Rouda	
Lewis	Rouzer	

NAYS—146

Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)
Allen	Collins (NY)	Green (TN)
Amash	Comer	Griffith
Arrington	Conaway	Grothman
Baird	Crawford	Guest
Balderson	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Banks	Curtis	Harris
Barr	Davidson (OH)	Hartzler
Biggs	DesJarlais	Hern, Kevin
Bilirakis	Duncan	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Hice (GA)
Bost	Emmer	Hill (AR)
Brady	Estes	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Hudson
Buchanan	Flores	Huizenga
Buck	Fortenberry	Hunter
Bucshon	Fox (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Budd	Fulcher	Johnson (SD)
Burchett	Gaetz	Jordan
Burgess	Gallagher	Joyce (PA)
Byrne	Gianforte	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	King (IA)
Chabot	Gooden	Kinzing
Cheney	Gosar	Kustoff (TN)
Cicilline	Granger	LaHood
Cline	Graves (GA)	Lamborn
Cloud	Graves (LA)	Langevin

Latta	Ratcliffe	Taylor
Lesko	Rice (SC)	Timmons
Long	Riggleman	Tipton
Loudermilk	Rodgers (WA)	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Roe, David P.	Wagner
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Marshall	Rose, John W.	Walker
McCarthy	Roy	Waltz
McCaul	Rutherford	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Meadows	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Meuser	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Miller	Shinkus	Williams
Mitchell	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Mooney (WV)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Norman	Smucker	Womack
Olson	Spano	Woodall
Palazzo	Steil	Wright
Palmer	Steube	Yoho
Perry	Stewart	Zeldin
Posey	Stivers	

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham	Higgins (LA)	Ryan
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Swalwell (CA)
Cleaver	Pence	
Cummings	Roby	

□ 1555

Mr. MARSHALL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BERGMAN, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, SMITH of Washington, HORSFORD, BABIN, and MASSIE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAFFIRMING AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE LAND INTO TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES

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. 375) to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 96, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—323

Adams	Bilirakis	Byrne
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Calvert
Allred	Bishop (UT)	Carbajal
Amash	Blumenauer	Cárdenas
Armstrong	Blunt Rochester	Carson (IN)
Axne	Bonamici	Carter (TX)
Babin	Bost	Cartwright
Bacon	Boyle, Brendan	Case
Baird	F.	Casten (IL)
Balderson	Brindisi	Castor (FL)
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Chu, Judy
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cisneros
Beatty	Buchanan	Clark (MA)
Bera	Bucshon	Clarke (NY)
Bergman	Bustos	Clay
Beyer	Butterfield	Clyburn

Cohen Kelly (IL)
 Cole Kennedy
 Conaway Khanna
 Connolly Kildee
 Cook Kilmer
 Cooper Kim
 Correa Kind
 Costa King (IA)
 Cox (CA) King (NY)
 Craig Kinzinger
 Crawford Kirkpatrick
 Crist Krishnamoorthi
 Crow Kuster (NH)
 Cuellar LaMalfa
 Cunningham Lamb
 Davids (KS) Lamborn
 Davis (CA) Larsen (WA)
 Davis, Danny K. Larson (CT)
 Davis, Rodney Lawrence
 Dean Lawson (FL)
 DeFazio Lee (CA)
 DeGette Levin (CA)
 DelBene Levin (MI)
 Delgado Lewis
 Demings Lieu, Ted
 DeSaulnier Lipinski
 Deutch Loeb sack
 Dingell Lofgren
 Doggett Lowenthal
 Doyle, Michael Lowey
 F, Lucas
 Duffy Luetkemeyer
 Dunn Luján
 Emmer Luria
 Engel Lynch
 Escobar Malinowski
 Eshoo Maloney,
 Espallat Carolyn B.
 Evans Maloney, Sean
 Ferguson Marshall
 Finkenauer Massie
 Fitzpatrick Mast
 Fleischmann Matsui
 Fletcher McAdams
 Fortenberry McBath
 Foster McCarthy
 Frankel McCaul
 Fudge McClintock
 Gabbard McCollum
 Gallagher McEachin
 Gallego McGovern
 Garamendi McHenry
 Garcia (IL) McNerney
 Garcia (TX) Meadows
 Golden Meeks
 Gomez Meng
 Gonzalez (OH) Mitchell
 Gonzalez (TX) Moolenaar
 Gottheimer Mooney (WV)
 Granger Moore
 Green (TX) Morelle
 Griffith Moulton
 Grijalva Mucarsel-Powell
 Guest Mullin
 Haaland Murphy
 Hagedorn Nadler
 Harder (CA) Napolitano
 Harris Neal
 Hastings Neguse
 Heck Newhouse
 Hern, Kevin Norcross
 Herrera Beutler Nunes
 Higgins (NY) O'Halleran
 Hill (AR) Ocasio-Cortez
 Hill (CA) Omar
 Holding Pallone
 Hollingsworth Panetta
 Horn, Kendra S. Pappas
 Horsford Pascrell
 Houlahan Payne
 Hoyer Perlmutter
 Huffman Peters
 Hurd (TX) Peterson
 Jackson Lee Phillips
 Jayapal Pingree
 Jeffries Pocan
 Johnson (GA) Porter
 Johnson (SD) Pressley
 Johnson (TX) Price (NC)
 Joyce (OH) Quigley
 Kaptur Raskin
 Katko Ratcliffe
 Keating Reed

NAYS—96

Aderholt Banks
 Allen Biggs
 Amodei Buck
 Arrington Budd

Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spano
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Stevens
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 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
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yarmuth
 Young

Burchett
 Burgess
 Carter (GA)
 Chabot

Cheney
 Cicilline
 Cline
 Cloud
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Courtney
 Crenshaw
 Curtis
 Davidson (OH)
 DeLauro
 DesJarlais
 Duncan
 Estes
 Flores
 Foxx (NC)
 Fulcher
 Gaetz
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Gooden
 Gosar
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Abraham
 Brady
 Brooks (IN)
 Cleaver

Abraham
 Brady
 Brooks (IN)
 Cleaver

NOT VOTING—12

Cummings
 Diaz-Balart
 Higgins (LA)
 Johnson (LA)
 Pence
 Roby
 Ryan
 Swalwell (CA)

□ 1603

Ms. GRANGER changed her 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.

QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS 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. 1892) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—415

Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilár
 Allen
 Allred
 Amash
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Axne
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Banks
 Barr
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady
 Brindisi
 Brooks (AL)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burchett

Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten (IL)
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Cisneros
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cloud
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Cook
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cox (CA)
 Craig
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crist
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Cunningham
 Curtis
 Davids (KS)
 Davidson (OH)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Davis, Rodney
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duffy
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Engel
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Estes
 Evans
 Finkenauer
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fletcher
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx (NC)
 Frankel
 Fudge
 Fulcher
 Gabbard
 Gaetz
 Gallagher
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Golden
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Gonzalez (TX)

Gooden
 Gosar
 Gottheimer
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Green (TX)
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Haaland
 Hagedorn
 Harder (CA)
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Heck
 Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill (AR)
 Hill (CA)
 Himes
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Horn, Kendra S.
 Horsford
 Houlahan
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huizenga
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson (TX)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 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 sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 Matsui
 McAdams
 McBath
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meeks
 Meng
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Mullin
 Murphy
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Norcross
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Olson
 Omar
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Riggleman
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner

Serrano	Takano	Walden
Sewell (AL)	Taylor	Walker
Shalala	Thompson (CA)	Walorski
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Waltz
Sherrill	Thompson (PA)	Wasserman
Shimkus	Thornberry	Schultz
Simpson	Timmons	Waters
Sires	Tipton	Watkins
Slotkin	Titus	Watson Coleman
Smith (MO)	Tlaib	Weber (TX)
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Torres (CA)	Welch
Smith (WA)	Torres Small	Wenstrup
Smucker	(NM)	Westerman
Soto	Trahan	Wexton
Spanberger	Trone	Wild
Spano	Turner	Williams
Speier	Underwood	Wilson (FL)
Stanton	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Stauber	Van Drew	Wittman
Stefanik	Vargas	Womack
Steil	Veasey	Woodall
Steube	Vela	Wright
Stevens	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Stewart	Visclosky	Yoho
Stivers	Wagner	Young
Suozzi	Walberg	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham	Ferguson	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Rutherford
Cleaver	Higgins (LA)	Ryan
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	McCauley	
Doggett	Pence	

□ 1613

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.

□ 1615

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

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. 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, 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. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

REPORT ON H.R. 2745, MILITARY
CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS
AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-63) on the bill (H.R. 2745) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Af-

fairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

EXPAND HEALTHCARE ACCESS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, the contrast between Republicans and Democrats on the issue of healthcare could not be any clearer.

Why do Republicans in the Trump administration want to make Americans sick again?

They want to eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions. They want to take us backward.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to make America healthy.

We want to expand healthcare access. We want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, and we want to make sure that people with preexisting conditions are not denied insurance coverage.

Madam Speaker, more than 200,000 people in New Jersey who purchased their insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplace have preexisting conditions. That is why H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act, is so important.

It would block the Trump administration's efforts to weaken the Affordable Care Act's protections for preexisting conditions, because there is no going back to healthcare discrimination.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK 2019

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize this week, May 12 through 18, as National Police Week 2019.

It is a privilege to take time this week to remember and honor our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who courageously defend American citizens and protect our communities.

They selflessly put their lives on the line to ensure that this Nation is one of safety and order.

Just this past week, in the First Congressional District of Georgia, this reality hit home when Sergeant Kelvin Ansari passed away in the line of duty while investigating a robbery.

Overall last year, 158 police officers died in the line of duty across the country.

As tens of thousands of police officers gather this week in Washington, D.C., and other cities throughout America, I hope that everyone will take some time to thank these individuals who work to keep us all safe.

To all of our police officers, thank you for your service to our communities. God bless you.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION AND
UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, how does one define a traitor?

According to Merriam Webster, a traitor is one who betrays another's trust or is false to an obligation or duty.

How does one define a traitor to a Nation?

By this definition, the Trump administration and some of its minions have some explaining to do. While snubbing—and even offending—key U.S. allies, the President and several of his crew have cozied up with Russia time after time.

This certainly doesn't strike me as dutiful.

Well, look at Paul Manafort, his campaign manager, or Michael Flynn, who have chosen to serve their Nation now in Federal prison because of violating the trust of the American people.

This blatant disregard of duty has reached new lows. President Trump's personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, recently announced a visit to Ukraine to chase conspiracy theories.

This is a dangerous time for Ukraine. Following a historic election, the Nation is now undergoing a transition of power in the face of Russian invasion.

The House of Representatives is watching. The American people are watching. Pay attention to traitors.

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

REBUILDING OUR NATION'S
CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Infrastructure Week, a week to highlight the importance and necessity of rebuilding our country's crumbling infrastructure, thus investing in our own future.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives U.S. infrastructure a "D plus" with over 56,000 bridges considered structurally deficient, major airports unable to keep up with the demand and outdated water pipelines experiencing an estimated 240,000 water main breaks annually.

In fact, my own district in Central Florida, one of the fastest growing in America, is crisscrossed by Interstate 4, which has been deemed one of the most dangerous highways in the entire Nation.

The need to invest in highway improvements, auxiliary roads, public

transportation, and airports is palpable.

As a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, upgrading infrastructure with 21st century technology would benefit all Americans, and can be done in a bipartisan manner.

If we seek to sustain the economic growth witnessed these last 2 years or simply keep our citizenry safe, further expansion of infrastructure hubs is necessary, and we should no longer delay in investing in our future. It is time to build and time for Congress to get to work.

HONORING THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, from the moment of their founding in 1882, the Knights of Columbus have made charity their first principle.

Their Liberty Council 1910, based at the parish of the Holy Cross in Bridgeton, New Jersey, is made up of a diverse group of men of the Catholic faith who are guided by the principles of charity, unity, fraternity, but particularly, by charity.

A short list of the good works they do includes: blood drives, planning and implementing youth activities, painting the parking lines in their churches, helping the homeless, advocating for the most vulnerable in our society, leading a diaper drive for new mothers in need of assistance, and helping with various fundraisers in the parish.

The Knights are committed to serving their parish, their community, and their country, and they do it without fanfare and without expecting thanks.

I want to thank the men of Liberty Council 1910 and all the local councils for their service to South Jersey, and the National Organization for its service to our great country, the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF BILL DUNLAP

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

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding constituent of the 15th Congressional District, Mr. Bill Dunlap, as he retires from his role as deputy director of the Athens-Hocking-Vinton 317 Board.

Madam Speaker, it is not news that we are facing a drug epidemic in this country. Families from Ohio to Oregon are torn apart by addiction, and we can't hope to overcome this crisis without outstanding individuals on the ground in each of those communities, without people who are compassionate and dedicated to their neighbors, without people like Bill Dunlap.

I have had a chance to see Mr. Dunlap's work firsthand over the

years. We have collaborated on drug task forces, and other community initiatives, and I can't say enough about his dedication and commitment to combating the drug crisis.

I can say without a doubt, Athens, Hocking and Vinton Counties—and truly, all of southeastern Ohio—are better and healthier places as a result of his efforts.

Madam Speaker, I am incredibly grateful for Bill's service and his leadership. I wish him the best in his next chapter.

ENSURING RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, all Americans deserve equal treatment under the law and should have these rights protected, including individuals in the LGBT community.

They should be able to compete equally for jobs, be assured equal opportunity in education, housing, financial, and judicial settings.

At the same time, the free exercise of religious beliefs is a core ideal of our country, protected in the Constitution and through Federal law.

The Equality Act explicitly prevents application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, RFRA. This law was passed nearly unanimously in 1993 by a Democratic House, Senate, and White House.

Congress has never passed a law that shrinks or exempts itself from RFRA. It is critical to ensuring that religious freedom stands a chance of being fully lived out and fairly treated in court.

This week, I will vote for the Equality Act for the broader goals. But before it becomes law, we must do more to ensure religious liberty.

THE EQUALITY ACT ENDGAME

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

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, usually it is easy to identify the endgame for bad policy.

Those who want open borders are looking for more votes. Those who support things like the Green New Deal want to eliminate fossil fuels and American energy strength along with it.

But here is the endgame for the Equality Act, or H.R. 5. It would flip our moral, social, legal, and religious fabric of this Nation upside down.

By erasing the recognition of gender from Federal law, the traditional family, laws, religious beliefs, morality and/or identity gets erased with it.

Madam Speaker, every man and woman in this body are special, and they should vote "no" on H.R. 5.

□ 1630

THE MUELLER REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to lead a reading of parts of the Mueller report, otherwise called the "Report On The Investigation Into Russian Interference In The 2016 Presidential Election." As I said, it is more commonly known as the Mueller report. It documents widespread and effective foreign intervention to target voters and influence the outcome of the 2016 election.

This operation, led by Russian agents, was a direct attack on our democracy. The report has not been taken seriously by the administration. Even worse, it has been ignored for fear it would somehow minimize President Trump's electoral college victory and bruise his ego.

It is critical that we set the record straight and work to address an ongoing threat that Russia poses to our future elections.

My fellow Members and I will be reading excerpts taken directly from the report, documenting the Russian campaign to secure a Trump Presidency.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), to read his quote.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, from volume I, page 14, section 2, entitled: "Russian 'Active Measures' Social Media Campaign," it read as follows:

"The IRA"—which was a Russian troll farm. "The IRA and its employees began operations targeting the United States as early as 2014. Using fictitious U.S. personas, IRA employees operated social media accounts and group pages designed to attract U.S. audiences. These groups and accounts, which addressed divisive U.S. political and social issues, falsely claimed to be controlled by U.S. activists. Over time, the social media accounts became a means to reach large U.S. audiences. IRA employees traveled to the United States in mid-2014 on an intelligence-gathering mission to obtain information and photographs for use in their social media posts."

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) to read a quote from the Mueller report.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, of course I am reading from volume I, pages 22 through 24, inclusive.

"Dozens of IRA employees were responsible for operating accounts and personas on different U.S. social media platforms. The IRA referred to employees assigned to operate the social

media accounts as ‘specialists.’ Starting as early as 2014, the IRA’s U.S. operations included social media specialists focusing on Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter. The IRA later added specialists who operated on Tumblr and Instagram accounts.

“Initially, the IRA created social media accounts that pretended to be the personal accounts of U.S. persons. By early 2015, the IRA began to create larger social media groups, or public social media pages that claimed (falsely) to be affiliated with the U.S. political and grassroots organizations. In certain cases, the IRA created accounts that mimicked real U.S. organizations. For example, one IRA-controlled Twitter account, @TEN—GOP, purported to be connected to the Tennessee Republican Party. More commonly, the IRA created accounts in the name of fictitious U.S. organizations and grassroots groups and used these accounts to pose as anti-immigration groups, Tea Party activists, Black Lives Matter protesters, and other U.S. social and political activists.

“The IRA closely monitored the activity of the social media accounts—redacted. By February 2016, internal IRA documents referred to support for the Trump campaign and opposition to candidate Clinton. For example,—redacted—directions to IRA operators—redacted. ‘Main idea: Use any opportunity to criticize Hillary Clinton and the rest, (except Sanders and Trump—we support them)’—redacted.

“The focus on the U.S. Presidential campaign continued throughout 2016. In—redacted—2016 internal—redacted—reviewing the IRA-controlled Facebook book ‘Secured Borders’ the author criticized the ‘lower number of posts dedicated to criticizing Hillary Clinton’ and reminded the Facebook specialist, ‘it is imperative to intensify criticizing Hillary Clinton.’ IRA employees also acknowledged that their work focused on influencing the U.S. Presidential election—redacted.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for reading.

Madam Speaker, I am going to read a quote from the Mueller reporter dealing with Russian interference.

“The first form of Russian election influence came principally from the Internet Research Agency”—and you will hear this evening, over and over again, the name IRA, and that is what it is—“the Internet Research Agency, LLC (IRA), a Russian organization, funded by Yevgeniy Viktorovich Prigozhin and companies he controlled, including Concord Management and Consulting LLC and Concord Catering, (collectively ‘Concord’). The IRA conducted social media operations targeted at large U.S. audiences with the goal of sowing discord in the U.S. political system. These operations constituted ‘active measures’”—and it is translated into Russian—“a term that typically refers to operations conducted by Russian security services aimed at influencing the course of international affairs.”

That is volume I, page 14.

I am going to read one more, and this is from volume I, pages 14 and 15.

“By the end of the 2016 U.S. election, the IRA”—that is that Russian organization that has influenced the media in the United States of America in our elections—“the IRA had the ability to reach millions of U.S. persons through their social media accounts. Multiple IRA-controlled Facebook groups and Instagram accounts had hundreds of thousands of U.S. participants. IRA-controlled Twitter accounts separately had tens of thousands of followers, including multiple U.S. political figures who retweeted IRA-created content. In November 2017, a Facebook representative testified that Facebook had identified 470 IRA-controlled Facebook accounts that collectively made 80,000 posts between January 2015 and August 2017. Facebook estimated the IRA reached as many as 126 million persons through its Facebook accounts. In January 2018, Twitter announced that it had identified 3,814 IRA-controlled Twitter accounts and notified approximately 1.4 million people Twitter believed may have been in contact with an IRA-controlled account.”

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. “The IRA organized and promoted political rallies inside the United States while posing as U.S. grassroots activists. First, the IRA used one of its preexisting social media personas (Facebook groups and Twitter accounts, for example) to announce and promote the event. The IRA then sent a large number of direct messages to followers of its social media account asking them to attend the event. From those who responded with interest in attending, the IRA then sought a U.S. person to serve as the event’s coordinator. In most cases, the IRA account operator would tell the U.S. person that they personally could not attend the event due to some preexisting conflict or because they were somewhere else in the United States. The IRA then further promoted the event by contacting U.S. media about the event and directing them to speak with the coordinator. After the event, the IRA posted videos and photographs of the event to the IRA’s social media accounts.

“The office identified dozens of U.S. rallies organized by the IRA. The earliest evidence of a rally was a ‘confederate rally’ in November 2015. The IRA continued to organize rallies, even after the 2016 U.S. Presidential election. The attendance at rallies varied. Some rallies appear to have drawn few (if any) participants, while others drew hundreds. The reach and success of these rallies was closely monitored—redacted.”

“Redacted.”

“From June 2016 until the end of Presidential campaign, almost all the U.S. rallies organized by the IRA focused on the U.S. election, often promoting the Trump campaign and opposing the Clinton campaign. Pro-

Trump rallies included three in New York, a series of pro-Trump rallies in Florida in August 2016, and a series of pro-Trump rallies in October 2016 in Pennsylvania. The Florida rallies drew the attention of the Trump campaign, which posted about the Miami rally on candidate Trump’s Facebook account (as discussed below).

“Many of the same IRA employees who oversaw the IRA’s social media accounts also conducted the day-to-day recruiting for political rallies inside the United States.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let me just remind everyone that the IRA stands for the organization that coordinated all of the online activities dealing with interference in the U.S. election.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) to read a quote.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is from volume I, page 6.

“Summer 2016. Russian outreach to the Trump campaign continued into the summer of 2016, as candidate Trump was becoming the presumptive Republican nominee for President. On June 9, 2016, for example, a Russian lawyer met with senior Trump campaign officials Donald Trump, Jr., Jared Kushner, and campaign chairman Paul Manafort to deliver what the email proposing the meeting had described as ‘official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary.’”

□ 1645

“The materials were offered to Trump Jr. as ‘part of Russia and its government’s support for Mr. Trump.’ The written communications setting up the meeting showed that the campaign anticipated receiving information from Russia that could assist candidate Trump’s electoral prospects, but the Russian lawyer’s presentation did not provide such information.”

Testimony of Colin Stretch, the general counsel of Facebook. This is in volume I, page 15.

“‘We estimate that roughly 29 million people were served content in their news feeds directly from the IRA’s,’” and that stands for the Internet Research Agency’s, “‘80,000 posts over the 2 years.’”

The IRA is the Russian organization in which some 30 persons have been indicted.

“‘Posts from these pages were also shared, liked, and followed by people on Facebook, and, as a result, three times more people may have been exposed to a story that originated from the Russian operation. Our best estimate is that approximately 126 million people may have been served content from a page associated with the IRA at some point during the 2-year period.’”

“The Facebook representative also testified that Facebook had identified 170 Instagram accounts that posted approximately 120,000 pieces of content during that time. Facebook did not

offer an estimate of the audience reached via Instagram.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Reading from volume I, page 33.

“The investigation identified two different forms of connections between the IRA and members of the Trump campaign. (The investigation identified no similar connections between the IRA and the Clinton campaign.) First, on multiple occasions, members and surrogates of the Trump campaign promoted—typically by linking, retweeting, or similar methods of reposting—pro-Trump or anti-Clinton content published by the IRA through IRA-controlled social media accounts. Additionally, in a few instances, IRA employees represented themselves as U.S. persons to communicate with members of the Trump campaign in an effort to seek assistance and coordination on IRA-organized political rallies inside the United States.”

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I will be reading now from volume I, page 36.

“Beginning in March 2016, units of the Russian Federation’s Main Intelligence Directorate of the General Staff (GRU) hacked the computers and email accounts of organizations, employees, and volunteers supporting the Clinton campaign, including the email account of campaign chairman John Podesta. Starting in April 2016, the GRU hacked into the computer networks of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) and the Democratic National Committee (DNC).

“The GRU targeted hundreds of email accounts used by Clinton campaign employees, advisers, and volunteers. In total, the GRU stole hundreds of thousands of documents from the compromised email accounts and networks. The GRU later released stolen Clinton campaign and DNC documents through online personas, ‘DCLeaks’ and ‘Guccifer 2.0,’ and later through the organization WikiLeaks. The release of the documents was designed and timed to interfere with the 2016 U.S. Presidential election and undermine the Clinton campaign.

“The Trump campaign showed interest in the WikiLeaks releases and, in the summer and fall of 2016—redacted. After—redacted—WikiLeaks’ first Clinton-related release—redacted—the Trump campaign stayed in contact—redacted—about WikiLeaks’ activities. The investigation was unable to resolve—redacted—WikiLeaks’ release of the stolen Podesta emails on October 7, 2016, the same day a video from years earlier was published of Trump using graphic language about women.”

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Volume I, page 35.

“Starting in June 2016, the IRA contacted different U.S. persons affiliated with the Trump campaign in an effort to coordinate pro-Trump IRA-organized rallies inside the United States.

In all cases, the IRA contacted the campaign while claiming to be U.S. political activists working on behalf of a conservative grassroots organization. The IRA’s contacts included requests for signs and other materials to use at rallies, as well as requests to promote the rallies and help coordinate logistics.

“While certain campaign volunteers agreed to provide the requested support (for example, agreeing to set aside a number of signs), the investigation has not identified evidence that any Trump campaign official understood the requests were coming from foreign nationals.”

Volume I, page 35.

“In sum, the investigation established that Russia interfered in the 2016 Presidential election through the ‘active measures’ social media campaign carried out by the IRA, an organization funded by Prigozhin and companies that he controlled. As explained further . . . the office concluded (and a grand jury has alleged) that Prigozhin, his companies, and IRA employees violated U.S. law through these operations, principally by undermining through deceptive acts the work of Federal agencies charged with regulating foreign influence in the U.S. elections.”

That is also volume I, page 35.

Volume I, pages 42 and 43.

“On June 14, 2016, the DNC and its cyber-response team announced the breach of the DNC network and suspected theft of DNC documents. In the statements, the cyber-response team alleged that Russian state-sponsored actors (which they referred to as ‘Fancy Bear’) were responsible for the breach.

“Apparently in response to that announcement, on June 15, 2016, GRU officers,” that is, the Russian spy agency officers, “using the persona Guccifer 2.0 created a WordPress blog. In the hours leading up to the launch of that WordPress blog, GRU officers logged into a Moscow-based server used and managed by Unit 74455 and searched for a number of specific words and phrases in English, including ‘some hundred sheets,’ ‘illuminati,’ and ‘worldwide known.’ Approximately 2 hours after the last of those searches, Guccifer 2.0 published its first post, attributing the DNC server hack to a lone Romanian hacker and using several of the unique English words and phrases that the GRU officers had searched for that day.

“That same day, June 15, 2016, the GRU also used the Guccifer 2.0 WordPress blog to begin releasing to the public documents stolen from the DNC and DCCC computer networks. The Guccifer 2.0 persona ultimately released thousands of documents stolen from the DNC and DCCC in a series of blog posts between June 15, 2016, and October 18, 2016.

“Released documents included opposition research performed by the DNC (including a memorandum analyzing potential criticisms of candidate

Trump), internal policy documents (such as recommendations on how to address politically sensitive issues), analyses of specific congressional races, and fundraising documents. Releases were organized around thematic issues, such as specific States (e.g., Florida and Pennsylvania) that were perceived as competitive in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election.”

That is volume I, pages 42 and 43.

This is now volume I, pages 49 and 50.

“Unit 26165 officers also hacked into a DNC account hosted on a cloud-computing service—redacted. On September 20, 2016, the GRU began to generate copies of the DNC data using—redacted—function designed to allow users to produce backups of databases (referred to—redacted—as ‘snapshots’). The GRU then stole those snapshots by moving them to—redacted—account that they controlled; from there, the copies were moved to GRU-controlled computers. The GRU stole approximately 300 gigabytes of data from the DNC cloud-based account.”

That was volume I, pages 49 and 50.

This is volume I, page 50.

“In addition to targeting individuals involved in the Clinton campaign, GRU officers also targeted individuals and entities involved in the administration of the elections. Victims included U.S. State and local entities, such as State boards of elections (SBOEs), secretaries of state, and county governments, as well as individuals who worked for those entities. The GRU also targeted private technology firms responsible for manufacturing and administering election-related software and hardware, such as voter registration software and electronic polling stations.”

□ 1700

“The GRU continued to target these victims through the elections in November 2016. While the investigation identified evidence that the GRU targeted these individuals and entities, the office did not investigate further. The office did not, for instance, obtain or examine servers or other relevant items belonging to these victims. The office understands that the FBI, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the States have separately investigated that activity.”

This is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

“The Trump campaign showed interest in WikiLeaks’ releases of hacked materials throughout the summer and fall of 2016—redacted.

“On June 12, 2016, Assange claimed in a televised interview to ‘have emails relating to Hillary Clinton which are pending publication,’ but provided no additional context.

“In debriefings with the office, former Deputy Campaign Chairman Rick Gates said that,—redacted. Gates recalled candidate Trump being generally frustrated that the Clinton emails had not been found.”

“Gates recalled candidate Trump being generally frustrated”—again it

says—"that the Clinton emails had not been found."

Again, that is volume I, pages 51 and 52.

I am hoping that some more Members come down, but if not, I am going to read just a couple more things.

"Many IRA operations used Facebook accounts created and operated by its specialists—redacted.

"IRA Facebook groups active during the 2016 campaign covered a range of political issues and included purported conservative groups (with names such as 'Being Patriotic,' 'Stop All Immigrants,' 'Secured Borders,' and 'Tea Party News,') purported Black social justice groups ('Black Matters,' 'Blacktivist,' and 'Don't Shoot Us'), LGBTQ groups ('LGBT United'), and religious groups ('United Muslims of America.')

"Throughout 2016, IRA accounts published an increasing number of materials supporting the Trump campaign and opposing the Clinton campaign. For example, on May 31, 2016, the operational account 'Matt Skiber' began to privately message dozens of pro-Trump Facebook groups asking them to help plan a 'pro-Trump rally near Trump Tower.'

"To reach larger U.S. audiences, the IRA purchased advertisements from Facebook that promoted the IRA groups on the news feeds of U.S. audience members. According to Facebook, the IRA purchased over 3,500 advertisements and the expenditures totaled approximately \$100,000.

"During the U.S. Presidential campaign, many IRA-purchased advertisements explicitly supported or promoted a Presidential candidate or promoted U.S. rallies organized by the IRA (discussed below). As early as March 2016, the IRA purchased advertisements that overtly opposed the Clinton campaign. For example, on March 18, 2016, the IRA purchased an advertisement depicting candidate Clinton and a caption that read in part, 'If one day God lets this liar enter the White House as a President—that day would be a real national tragedy.'"

That was a quote from the ad that they paid for.

"Similarly, on April 6, 2016, the IRA purchased advertisements for its account 'Black Matters' calling for a 'flash mob' of U.S. persons to 'take a photo with #HillaryClintonForPrison2016 or #noHillary2016.' IRA-purchased advertisements featuring Clinton were, with very few exceptions, negative."

Again, this is a Russian agency, Russian corporation.

"IRA-purchased advertisements referencing candidate Trump largely supported his campaign. The first known IRA advertisement explicitly endorsing the Trump campaign was purchased on April 19, 2016. The IRA bought an advertisement for its Instagram account 'Tea Party News' asking U.S. persons to help them 'make a patriotic team of young Trump supporters'—I will say

that again: "make a patriotic team of young Trump supporters"—"by uploading photos with the hashtag #KIDS4TRUMP. In subsequent months, the IRA purchased dozens of advertisements supporting the Trump campaign, predominantly through the Facebook groups 'Being Patriotic,' 'Stop All Invaders' and 'Secured Borders.'

"Collectively, the IRA's social media accounts reached tens of millions of U.S. persons. Individual IRA social media accounts attracted hundreds of thousands of followers. For example, at the time they were deactivated by Facebook in mid-2017, the IRA's 'United Muslims of America' Facebook group had over 300,000 followers, the 'Don't Shoot Us' Facebook group had over 250,000 followers, the 'Being Patriotic' Facebook group had over 200,000 followers, and the 'Secured Borders' Facebook group had over 130,000 followers. According to Facebook, in total the IRA-controlled accounts made over 80,000 posts before their deactivation in August 2017, and these posts reached at least 29 million U.S. persons and 'may have reached an estimated 126 million people.'"

That is Volume I, pages 24 to 26.

Madam Speaker, I am going to yield back my time.

I think it is worth people taking a look at the Mueller report. You can get it in book form. You can also download it for free. It can be downloaded for free from—I think it is the Justice Department, isn't it? The Justice Department website.

I think, seeing the extent and reading the words that talk about the extent of Russian interference in our elections is really important, especially as we head into a new election cycle where Americans want to have confidence that their vote really matters, that the messages that they are getting are legitimate ones from inside the United States of America, and that Russian or any other foreign influence is not using the internet, using names that are supposed to sound like they are American organizations and American websites and American Facebook pages.

I think it is very important for people to learn about that. It is worth the read.

Actually, if you consider all the redactions, it is not as long a read as you might think. And then all of us would be informed.

About 3 percent of Americans have read the Mueller report, and I would certainly encourage more.

One of our colleagues, MARY GAY SCANLON, I know, is going to begin at noon tomorrow with a full reading. It is going to be done in one of the House rooms here, upstairs in the Rules Committee, a reading of the Mueller report.

Otherwise, I think people have misguided information about what is in it and the idea that there is really nothing at all that is important.

Those Americans who are interested in the sanctity of our elections, I would

very much encourage. You could even watch the reading that is going on starting at noon tomorrow of the full Mueller report. And consider the threat to our elections and that we have to do everything we can to make sure that there is no outside interference.

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

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE BUDGET

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, called our national debt "the single biggest threat to national security."

Since then, we have added more than \$7 trillion more in red ink. Our national debt today stands at \$22 trillion, and it is only getting worse.

The Congressional Budget Office is projecting trillion-dollar deficits in perpetuity. These deficits will leave future generations like my daughter's generation saddled with higher taxes, stagnant growth, and a lower standard of living. This is simply unacceptable.

Thankfully, pro-growth policies implemented by President Trump and congressional Republicans have led to a booming economy with 3.2 percent GDP growth and unemployment below 4 percent.

Our strong economy provides Congress a unique opportunity to tackle this problem, but bold leadership is required to do so.

Unfortunately, it is clear that there will be no such leadership from the Democrats. The Democrats have failed to perform the most basic function of government, which is passing a budget. In fact, they have not even bothered to bring a budget to the floor for a vote. Why, you might ask? Because the radical left is now in control of the Democratic agenda and demanding trillions of dollars in additional spending for programs like the Green New Deal, which aims to eliminate everything from air travel to requiring every single building in the United States to be rebuilt or upgraded, banning farting cows, and will cost upwards of \$92 trillion to implement; or, another budget-busting initiative like Medicare-for-all, which would increase government spending by \$32 trillion over the next decade.

□ 1715

Think about that for a moment. The Democrats look at \$22 trillion in debt,

trillion-dollar deficits, and think that we aren't spending enough already of our taxpayer dollars.

Thankfully, the Republican Study Committee is here to do something about it, and we have taken the challenge head-on.

As chairman of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force, I am very proud to have worked with a task force of eight of my colleagues, as well as the rest of our 141-member strong Republican Study Committee, to produce the "Preserving American Freedom" budget resolution.

This budget reduces government debt by cutting \$12.6 trillion in wasteful spending over the next 10 years.

It ensures permanent solvency for Medicare and Social Security so that these programs will exist for the seniors who rely on them today, as well as for future generations.

It repeals ObamaCare and gives unprecedented control to the States to design healthcare programs that fit the unique needs of their citizens.

It reforms welfare to move more people into employment with a sense of purpose and self-reliance.

Finally, it matches President Trump's commitment to national security by fully funding the border wall and making the necessary investments in our military to ensure the safety of the American people from foreign threats.

The "Preserving American Freedom" budget is the only serious proposal from Congress to address Washington's addiction to spending and a bloated and growing national debt. I am very proud to have led the RSC's effort to tackle this generational challenge and ensure a brighter future for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, tonight, we are going to hear from some of my colleagues about this very important budget proposal and what we can do to address fiscal responsibility so desperately needed in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I am rising also to join my coworkers in advocating for fiscal responsibility as Congress seeks to craft a budget.

The RSC budget is bold, and I am pleased to see it include such proposals as requiring the Congressional Budget Office to account for debt servicing in the cost estimates they prepare for Congress. My bill, H.R. 638, the Cost Estimates Improvement Act, would do that very thing.

Before legislation passes either the House or the Senate, lawmakers should know how much it will actually cost. This would seem to go without saying, but lawmakers consistently overlook one key cost, the new interest payments their spending will create. Folks back home understand how important this is, that we should be honest about the true cost of spending.

If you were budgeting for monthly car payments and only considered the

list price of the car itself and didn't factor in the extra cost of interest payments, you would later discover that the total cost is more than you could afford. Unfortunately, this is exactly what Congress does when considering new spending.

Congress relies on the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to estimate the cost of legislation. But Congress does not require either of them to include the cost of servicing the additional debt that is created by authorizing or reauthorizing spending. This results in an incomplete picture of the total actual cost.

Servicing national debt is becoming a substantial part of Federal spending. Within just a few years, our Nation will be spending more on interest payments than on the entire Department of Defense. This should alarm all of us, as this will increasingly crowd out other spending priorities.

I introduced H.R. 638, the Cost Estimates Improvement Act, to address these problems by requiring the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to add the cost of servicing the debt to the cost estimates of any future legislation.

In essence, Congress is not considering the comprehensive budgetary impact of spending and tax proposals. This distorts congressional decision-making in favor of more spending and debt accumulation.

Congress routinely ignores the true costs and overstates the benefits of new spending. The American people have to account for the cost of debt in their family budgets, and providing Congress with accurate cost estimates that include the cost of debt servicing is a commonsense reform that would hold Congress to the same standard, forcing lawmakers to reckon with the actual cost of raising our national debt.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend and fellow classmate of the last congressional class, a great conservative leader in the Congress.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the budget action team chair for this fine work and for yielding time.

We should be debating right now in Congress a budget. We should be debating ideas from the Democrats, ideas from the Republicans, the RSC budget. We should be doing that to develop a road map for the current year and for future years for appropriations, what our priorities are.

You will note that we are talking about it, but it is pretty quiet down here today. Why? Because, unfortunately, the leadership of the Democratic Party has been unable to produce a budget. They can't agree, even among themselves, what a budget should be.

I spent 35 years in private business. Budgets are pretty basic. Without them, I don't know how you operate.

Apparently, we are going to try, and that is unfortunate.

My focus tonight is on the Federal budgeting and appropriations process and what we need to do to fix it. We can fix individual items in our budget, but long term, we need to fix the process, or we are, in fact, as noted earlier by Mr. CLOUD, doomed for some pretty dire outcomes.

The Federal budget and appropriations restraints under current law are totally ineffective. They simply do not work. And you know what? We can fix this.

Virtually all Federal spending right now is mandatory. Two-thirds of what we spend every year is called mandatory spending. It is on autopilot.

Let me give you some examples of what that means. \$2,523 billion is mandatory. Our interest payments in 2018 will be \$325 billion. I want you to stop and think about what a massive number that is.

The Federal debt crossed \$22 trillion last year. It now exceeds the entire annual production of the United States and equates to more than \$67,000 for every American in this country. Over the next 10 years, interest alone on the Federal debt will be the third largest Federal expenditure.

Now, at home, if that was what you were dealing with, you would be calling a debt counselor. If your interest payment alone was the third highest expenditure you had—never mind principal, just the interest—you are in serious trouble. Here, we call it government.

This process robs the American people of their voice, their representation. Long term, it will rob them of the basic opportunity for services if we don't get this under control.

The RSC "Preserving American Freedom" budget proposal and what I propose address that issue.

First and foremost, we must address what is called mandatory spending. Mandatory spending has taken on this huge component. As I said, it is two-thirds of Federal expenditures.

We need to move everything except Social Security, Medicare, and TRICARE to discretionary spending and require everybody in this room and this building to vote, to put their priorities forward, rather than have it be on autopilot.

The second thing we need to do is not have it simply be whatever we spent last year. How much more are we going to spend? We need to require zero-based budgeting of all agencies every few years—maybe 3 years because they are so big, frankly—where they have to justify down to the penny what they are spending money on. Because you know what a budget cut is in Washington? A budget cut in Washington is you get less money than the increase you asked for and they tell you they took a budget cut.

I spent 35 years in private business. A budget cut means you actually spend less than what you spent last year. You

spend less money, less real cash, not that you didn't get as much as you asked for.

Frankly, that is like my teenagers and allowance. Well, you cut my budget. No, I didn't give you as much as you asked for.

Second, the next thing we need to do is we need to use a 51-vote requirement for budgets, 51 votes to pass a budget, a simple majority. We need to say 51 votes to make any change in discretionary outlays. That way, in fact, we can manage our budget appropriations and not have the system manage us, not have the Senate decide no, we need 60 votes, and we just go along our merry way, putting out money hand over fist.

Additionally, we need to change a few rules about how we manage ourselves. We need to require there be no recess until budget appropriations are completed. Everyone stays here. Frankly, I think we just lock the doors and stay here till we get it done because, far too often, we will just do a continuing resolution.

You would be disgusted at the number of continuing resolutions that happen for a week, 3 days. All these continuing resolutions, all we do is spend the same money. So, sorry, no recess until we get it done.

Additionally, we need to withhold the pay for all Members of Congress until we get the job done, until there are budget and appropriations resolutions done for the year.

When we hit the time that we should be funded already for the year, if it is not done, everyone on the payroll here that is a Member of Congress doesn't get paid, because I know how to get folks' attention after 35 years in private business.

There is one way to put it: Follow the money. Other ways are not appropriate on the floor of the House, but you have the idea.

We have to address this issue. The only way to address this is to get our appropriations under control.

One of the things I proposed, in conjunction with another Member, is the Protecting Our Children's Future Act, which talks about these changes that must be made in how we do budgeting and appropriations in a process. Otherwise, we just do the same thing over and over again here in Congress, and that, Madam Speaker, is the perfect definition of insanity.

I appreciate the time to talk about something I think is so urgent because, without this fundamental change, we are tilting at windmills. We need to make this change sooner than later.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, what I hear from Hoosiers all over my district is that they sent their Representatives here to bring back fiscal sanity, to balance our budget. That is what hard-working Hoosier families do every day.

It is what they have come to find in their State legislature in my great home State of Indiana as well. Indiana has a balanced budget amendment. We

have legislators who go to the State house and pass fiscally responsible budgets every 2 years.

It was a pleasure of mine for 6 years to serve with the next speaker, somebody who is a true American hero and one of the great conservative leaders of this freshman class in the new Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the RSC 2020 budget.

I have a copy of that here, so I encourage everyone to take the opportunity to study it and look for those positive aspects that are important that Congressman BANKS and his team put together to have a balanced budget.

It reduces Federal spending by over \$12 trillion in the next decade and balances our Federal budget in the next 6 years.

As the gentleman mentioned, the State of Indiana passed an amendment to the constitution in 2018 to require our budgets to balance, and Hoosiers have enjoyed a balanced State budget since 2012.

We are among a minority of States that have a Triple-A credit rating, and Indiana has cut 15 different taxes while still balancing our budget and funding key State priorities.

This proposed budget addresses out-of-control spending and rightfully aims to significantly decrease our national debt. We are \$22 trillion in debt as a Nation. That is not my money. That is money that belongs to the taxpayers. Because we have been paying interest on this debt for decades, it is really the money of our next generation of American taxpayers, our kids and our grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of what Hoosiers have been able to do in our State, and I will continue to fight for that same Hoosier common sense here in D.C.

□ 1730

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the State of Indiana has so much to be proud of. Indiana provides a road map for the rest of the Nation when it comes to fiscal responsibility.

There are few leaders in the House of Representatives who do as much for the conservative cause and promote fiscal responsibility as Representative HICE from the great State of Georgia.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I appreciate those kind words.

Madam Speaker, I rise with my colleagues this evening in support of the Republican Study Committee budget for 2020.

Here in Congress, there are immense problems and vast issues that we deal with, and sometimes they can feel overwhelming. For that reason, it is important that we have a purpose, that

we have a vision, that we have a pathway to get us out of some of the issues that we face and to give us a sense of purpose for getting through those things, a playbook, if you will.

Madam Speaker, I just want to publicly commend my colleagues who have labored so diligently to put together this draft. I especially want to recognize the RSC chairman, MIKE JOHNSON, and the Spending Task Force chairman, JIM BANKS, my good friend. Their leadership has been invaluable, and we are deeply appreciative to all of them.

I am particularly pleased that in this budget they have included a proposal to eliminate official time. This is something I have been working on for a long time.

For those who may not be familiar with it, official time allows a Federal employee who is part of a union to conduct union activities in the course of their workday even if that means not doing the job that they were hired to do.

In many cases, people are hired to do a job and yet 100 percent of their time is spent doing Federal union activities, and so the taxpayer is paying these people to do a job which they are not doing. It ends up these agencies have to hire someone else to do a job while the first individual is doing union activities rather than that for which they were hired.

Over the years since I have been here, I have personally tried to cut some of the official time usage. That didn't work. We have tried diligently to reform official time, to no avail. We have even tried to just provide some degree of transparency, and yet in every attempt, everything that we have tried to do, we have faced tremendous opposition both from Federal employee unions and many of their allies here in Congress.

Make no mistake, the opposition is real; it is strong; it is entrenched in this place. And yet we have got to continue to move forward. We have got to try to address these issues.

The Federal bureaucracy has tremendous power and influence over our lives, and yet in this case of official time, there is little to no transparency or accountability.

To add to the problem, it is virtually impossible to remove a Federal employee. According to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, it can take between 170 and 370 days to remove a bad actor, a bad worker in a Federal position, and this is because of the appeals process, grievances that can be filed, complaints that just drag on and on and on.

There are thousands, by the way, of Federal employees who agree with me. Recently, a survey found that 31 percent of Federal employees feel that there are few to little steps taken to remove or deal with poor-performing employees in the Federal Government.

So, Madam Speaker, we need to restore fiscal sanity around here. We

need to enforce accountability and instill transparency in our Federal Government, and I believe this RSC budget is a step in that direction. It rises in stark contrast to the nonexistent budget of the Democratic majority.

So with that, again, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments tonight.

Madam Speaker, as I said before, there are 140 members of the Republican Study Committee. Many of those 140 members are new freshman Members who were elected just beginning of this Congress, who are conservative Members who stepped up to the plate to preach fiscal responsibility, to keep the commitments that they made on the campaign trail. One of those new Members is my colleague and friend, Representative HERN from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand with my colleagues today to stress the importance of fiscal health in our country.

There is a very real problem here. If we don't address it, we are condemning our children to doom.

My colleagues across the aisle like to use the 12 years left hyperbole to talk about the necessity to act on climate change, but they ignore the fiscal cliff we are standing on, a much more imminent threat to the well-being of our country and our people.

Instead of addressing the debt crisis, the Democrat majority chose not to draft a budget at all this year. That tells us all we need to know about their priorities.

Speaker PELOSI herself said: Show me your budget, and I will show you your values.

So, without a budget, what are the majority's values?

The RSC budget addresses our deficits and aims to balance by 2025. This budget refocuses spending on our core constitutional responsibilities and limits the growth of government.

Forty-nine out of the 50 United States are required to have a balanced budget, but the Federal Government does not have that requirement. A budget that balances is the first and most important step towards financial well-being for our country.

I spent more than 30 years as a business owner before coming to Congress. In the business world, a company will fail if they continually spend more money than they bring in. You just can't do it.

That is a foreign concept to many of my colleagues here. In fact, several people in this building believe that the best way to address our debt is to ignore its existence entirely. That is just simply ridiculous. Problems don't just disappear. They don't disappear for you or me. You have to take corrective action, and this budget does just that.

The former Secretary of Defense, General James Mattis, testified that our national debt is the greatest threat to our democracy. It is rather chilling that we borrow money from other nations to fund things like our military, who then must protect us from the very nations that we borrow money from.

We can only defend ourselves on borrowed money for so long. What happens when we run out of other people's money?

I find it interesting that Democrats only seem to care about our debt after we start putting taxpayer dollars back in people's pockets. No one is talking about the fact that Democrat proposals coming from Congress will, alone, cost over \$100 trillion in new spending. Why aren't we holding hearings about that?

This budget is the only budget put forward in the House so far. It deserves our attention and our consideration because we are the only ones trying to right the ship.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma said, the Republican Study Committee budget is the only budget proposal on the table. It is the only proposal that balances the budget, that begins to rein in wasteful government spending and begins to pay down a disastrous \$22 trillion national debt.

There are few Members in this Congress whom I have served with who have preached fiscal responsibility as much as my friend and my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BANKS for yielding, for the Special Order here this evening, for his leadership in crafting this very important budget, and for this discussion we are having on it tonight.

Madam Speaker, obviously, we have been waiting on a budget to vote on in the United States Congress and have yet to see a budget. Then I think we learned that there may not be a budget in the United States Congress this year.

That is very hard to understand because we are spending \$4 trillion to \$4.2 trillion. Two-thirds of that \$4.2 trillion is mandatory spending, which is basically on automatic pilot, and it is skyrocketing. The biggest increases in our deficit are created by this mandatory spending.

On the discretionary side, it is about a third of what we spend totally. As far as discretionary spending goes, we have had some modest increases.

For the first part of the time that I was in Congress, we basically had budget caps, and, actually, discretionary spending was held to the same level the entire time.

I think it is sad that we are financing our standard of living in my generation on the backs of my children and their children and their children and their children.

So what do we do about it?

I am very proud to talk about what JIM BANKS and his leadership and what the Republican Study Committee have done in presenting here this evening. This budget exemplifies fiscal sanity and preserves American freedom.

As most of you know, I spent my career in the running of small businesses, starting out in the construction industry, then participating in the banking industry and electronic medical records and real estate development. I did this in conjunction with my wife, Robin, as my partner.

Many times, we would sit down at the kitchen table, just like every other American family, and we would map out a budget. I knew that spending more than my means was simply out of the question.

Well, folks, why can't we do that here in Washington? We need more fiscal common sense here in Washington, and the RSC fiscal year 2020 budget does just that.

Picture this: \$12.6 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years, balancing the budget in just 6 years by 2025. On that fact alone, I would hope that every Member of this body would offer their support.

This budget also fosters a rewarding environment for economic growth and job creation.

We have heard it over and over again from those who deal in investments and deal with the economy and the growth of the economy that the biggest wind at our face is this budget deficit. It is a headwind. It is going to be a headwind against the growth of this economy if we don't get serious about a budget.

This budget will give us that opportunity for economic growth and job creation.

Right now, we have the best economy in the world: 263,000 jobs were created last month, and over 7 million jobs are available throughout this Nation, far exceeding the number of jobseekers.

I was so glad to work with my colleagues here in Congress the last 2 years and with the President in making this happen. But the American people made it happen. All we did was provide an opportunity. We reformed regulations and we passed a tax reform bill that gave the economy a boost.

Frankly, in dealing with the budget deficit and going forward, our only hope in this is to grow our economy. We must have GDP growth.

In a telephone townhall with constituents from Georgia's 12th District last night, 73 percent of participants reported that our economy is headed in the right direction. When I ran for Congress in 2014, 70 percent of the people in my district said that the economy was going in the wrong direction, and we have flipped it.

However, a soaring economy also creates challenges. As we face increasing workforce needs, this budget prioritizes moving Americans off the sidelines and back into the workforce, rewarding work and promoting innovation.

Madam Speaker, I am the grandfather of 13 beautiful grandchildren, and the last thing I want to do is leave an insurmountable debt behind for our future generations. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to get onboard with the RSC budget to restore a sense of fiscal responsibility to Washington. Our future depends on it.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, a great friend and a great conservative in the House of Representatives, for being here tonight.

Madam Speaker, when the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, MIKE JOHNSON from Louisiana, asked me to take on this task as chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force, I was very proud to do so, not just because I have enormous respect for Chairman JOHNSON as a conservative leader in this Congress, but because of the stature and reputation of the Republican Study Committee.

□ 1745

At one point, our Vice President, from my home State, MIKE PENCE, one of the greatest conservative leaders in this Nation, was chairman of the Republican Study Committee. And so, too, was another man whom I respect just as much, one of the greatest leaders in our Nation, the Republican whip, Mr. STEVE SCALISE, from Louisiana, chair of the Republican Study Committee, too. The reputation of RSC is important because it is the conservative vehicle in the Congress to advance conservative principles. No one does that more on a daily basis than my friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding and for his kind words, too, especially. He has been a great friend and a great leader on this front. I want to commend him for taking on the task of putting together a budget, Madam Speaker, that confronts some of the challenges that our country is facing in a way that not only protects those promises that were made, for example, to seniors.

Seniors were promised the safety net of Medicare, and yet, if we do nothing—and there are some suggesting that we leave Medicare where it is today—it actually goes bankrupt, Madam Speaker, in the next 8 years. It would be irresponsible for us, as Members of Congress, to sit back and say we are afraid to confront these important issues, because failing to confront them literally would lead to a bankrupt program for seniors today and a broken promise by the Federal Government to those seniors.

So we save Medicare from bankruptcy and, in fact, we do it in a way that nothing changes for current seniors. In fact, the only thing that would change is if we didn't do this, it would go bankrupt. So the program is actu-

ally solvent again, not only for current seniors, but for younger people, too, who don't think it will be there. In fact, it won't be there for them the way it is for current seniors if we don't make these bold reforms.

Madam Speaker, we also save the Social Security program, another important promise made to people who work through their years and then want to retire and have a safety net. And, today, maybe they have got a lot of other means of savings, too. They might have 401(k)s, or they might have a pension plan from their company. But they also paid into that Social Security trust fund. And, again, if we do nothing, that program goes bankrupt, as well. So we save that program, again, not only for current seniors, but then for younger people. It will also be there for them, too, generationally saving it.

Just like when Ronald Reagan worked with Tip O'Neill to save Social Security from bankruptcy, they did it in a way that actually strengthened the program. So for those people who want to hold their head in the sand and say, don't do anything, not doing anything means those two vital programs—Medicare and Social Security—would go bust for seniors today. We can't let that happen.

Madam Speaker, I thank our leader, Mr. BANKS, for doing that.

And then, again, we strengthen defense. We continue to build on the reforms we have made to our economy so that we are able to create more jobs, so that we repeal the death tax. We continue lowering taxes, which has gotten such a great revolution in job creation and higher wages for workers. The things that we are doing that are working, we build upon those things and make this country even stronger and greater for generations.

So while putting a budget together is tough—and I know the other side hasn't even passed a budget out of committee, Madam Speaker—we, with this RSC budget, have shown what bold conservative reforms can do to strengthen programs like Medicare, like Social Security, encourage innovation in failing programs, block granting Medicaid to States so States can innovate, strengthening defense, and, again, building on the great successes we are seeing in our economy so that wages can be higher, and we protect people with preexisting conditions.

These are the kinds of things that people call on us to do. We come here to Congress to do the big things, to tackle the tough problems in a way where we protect people who count on us and actually strengthen this country for future generations, so we can build on this great American Dream.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, this Republican Study Committee budget proposal was a gigantic effort: over 300 member proposals from the 141 members of the Republican Study Committee who offered ideas and proposals to include in this budget proposal.

Over the past several weeks, we met on a weekly basis, almost a dozen times, to put together this budget proposal, assembling a task force of eight conservative members, who gathered on a weekly basis to comb through the Federal budget to talk about ways that we could put forth something that conservatives, not just in Congress but throughout the country, could be very proud of.

I am really proud that, on our task force, we had Members who came from different States, different perspectives, who had different ideas. That made the effort stronger and, in the end, it allowed us to produce a stronger budget proposal. One of those members, I am very proud to say, is my friend, the representative from Florida, my colleague, Representative YOHO.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the RSC Budget Committee for yielding to me, along with Chairman MIKE JOHNSON, for leading the way on this task. I thank all of my colleagues who participated in this, and the RSC staff who did the hard work. They were there every night and every day to bring this budget together—Richard Stern, Jay, and Mark. Many times, they don't get recognized for the work that they did, but yet they put in a lot of effort.

So why do a budget? Everybody asks, why do you guys worry about a budget? Well, this House is tasked with the power of the purse. We are the ones who are supposed to be in charge of a budget and spending the people's money, because the American people care how we spend their money. They want us to spend it smartly, prudently, and responsibly. If you don't have a budget, can you do that?

We have got a budget. Right here, we have got a budget. This is a budget. This is a good budget. We are at \$22 trillion in debt. This Nation is at \$22 trillion in debt.

In the previous administration, we saw the debt double. This administration, it will probably double again. And if a Democrat gets in, or a Republican, it will probably double again. If this body does not come together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans, this problem will never be addressed. What happens is a political divide happens because we can blame the other side for not doing what they are supposed to.

We didn't have a budget last year and the Democrats don't have a budget this year. So how serious is this body about correcting this? The Republican Study Committee has a budget. This budget needs to be looked at.

I was born in the fifties—1955—and I grew up during the sixties. Our mandatory spending in this country was roughly 30 percent; 70 percent was discretionary spending. Do you know what that allows you to do? That allows you to do an interstate system, and it allows you to have a space program and have aspirations of going to

the Moon and coming back by a Democratic President who put country above politics. We came together, and we did that because we could.

Do you know what? We can't do that today, because, today, 71 percent of our spending is mandatory, and 29 percent is discretionary. But let me tell you who can do that.

China can go to the Moon. China can do infrastructure. In fact, they are doing it all over the world. Do you know why? Because they are cash rich. We are cash poor. In fact, they hold a large portion of our debt.

Let me tell you what \$22 trillion in debt is. If you take \$22 trillion and divide it by 330 million Americans, roughly, that comes down to \$67,000, not per family, but per individual. So for 300 million Americans, they are \$67,000 in debt.

Is it my fault? Yeah, I guess so, because I am here. It is your fault, it is their fault. If we are here, this is our generation's fault, and this is something that we have to come together as Americans to fix.

If we don't have a budget, can we fix a budget problem? If we don't have a budget, can we acknowledge a problem?

As I pointed out, the other side doesn't have a budget. There is a budget and if we come together as Americans and put down the crazy politics of fighting one side over the other, we can fix the problems of this country. We can fix education, we can fix healthcare, we can fix infrastructure, and we can plan for a future brighter than today. We can create a vision for this country 50 to 100 years down the road, but we can't do it if we are fighting over budgetary problems in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor to be able to be on this committee. I hope it sinks into the other side that we come together, and we come together as Americans.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, we need to confront this fiscal challenge now, as it is no longer a far-off concern.

Currently, we are set to run trillion-dollar deficits in perpetuity. The Social Security trust fund will be bankrupt by 2035. The Medicare trust fund will be bankrupt by 2026. Without bold and immediate action, this growing debt will condemn America to a future that is less prosperous and less free.

My colleagues and I from the Republican Study Committee are determined to make sure that this never materializes. The Republican Study Committee preserving the American freedom budget would not only prevent that bleak future, it would ensure even greater prosperity for all Americans for years and generations to come.

I could not be prouder to lead this effort on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and its 141 conservative members.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHUCK GRASSLEY, President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2019.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Public Law 93-344, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives hereby appoint Dr. Phillip Swagel as the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective June 3, 2019, for the term expiring January 3, 2023.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore
of the Senate.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House
of Representatives.

DECLARING A NATIONAL EMERGENCY TO SECURE THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-35)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency to deal with the threat posed by the unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries.

Foreign adversaries are increasingly creating and exploiting vulnerabilities in information and communications technology and services, which store and communicate vast amounts of sensitive information, facilitate the digital economy, and support critical infrastructure and vital emergency services, in order to commit malicious

cyber-enabled actions, including economic and industrial espionage against the United States and its people. Although maintaining an open investment climate in information and communications technology, and in the United States economy more generally, is important for the overall growth and prosperity of the United States, such openness must be balanced by the need to protect our country against critical national security threats. To deal with this threat, additional steps are required to protect the security, integrity, and reliability of information and communications technology and services provided and used in the United States.

The Executive Order prohibits certain transactions involving information and communications technology or services where the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the United States Trade Representative, the Director of National Intelligence, the Administrator of General Services, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and, as appropriate, the heads of other executive departments and agencies (agencies), has determined that:

(i) the transaction involves information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied, by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a foreign adversary; and

(ii) the transaction:

(A) poses an undue risk of sabotage to or subversion of the design, integrity, manufacturing, production, distribution, installation, operation, or maintenance of information and communications technology or services in the United States;

(B) poses an undue risk of catastrophic effects on the security or resiliency of United States critical infrastructure or the digital economy of the United States; or

(C) otherwise poses an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States or the security and safety of United States persons.

I have delegated to the Secretary the authority to, in consultation with, or upon referral of a particular transaction from, the heads of other agencies as appropriate, take such actions, including directing the timing and manner of the cessation of transactions prohibited pursuant to the Executive Order, adopting appropriate rules and regulations, and employing all other powers granted to the President by IEEPA, as may be necessary to implement the Executive Order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive Order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 2019.*

□ 1800

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, there are over a dozen caucuses in Congress today that address issues facing servicemembers and/or veterans, but none of these are geared towards addressing the issues faced by the fastest growing cohort in our Nation's military: women.

Today, that changes.

My name is CHRISSY HOULAHAN, and I represent Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District. Today I am announcing the launch of the first ever Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus.

When the draft ended in 1973, women represented just 2 percent of the enlisted force and 8 percent of the officer corps. Today, those numbers have grown to 16 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Currently, there are 2 million living women veterans in the United States, and in the next 25 years, women veterans are projected to nearly double their population and will account for one in five living veterans.

We cannot afford to wait, and the time to act is now.

Twenty-seven years ago, I gave birth to my first child, my daughter Molly. I was Active Duty at the time, and I was given 6 weeks of maternity leave. When I returned, I intended to enroll my daughter in the on-base childcare but discovered that there was a 6-month-long waiting list. I looked for private care in Boston where I was serving, but the cost was too high. In fact, my entire paycheck would have gone to childcare.

I was a lieutenant in the Air Force, stationed at Hanscom Air Force Base at the time, and my assignment, my job, was to determine what kind of information people needed and in what order and in what visual display when ballistic missiles were raining down on them and the end of the world was coming.

I am a very well-educated engineer. I became an engineer in the Air Force, and yet I couldn't, with my skills and my education, figure out how I was

supposed to make ends meet and make childcare work to fulfill my military responsibilities and serve our country.

I was going against the system in many ways, a new mother serving in the military with a working civilian husband. That is not what most people picture when they picture a traditional military family. It wasn't even what I saw as a young girl when I was growing up.

I was the daughter and granddaughter of career Naval officers and career Navy wives, and I watched as my mother and my grandmother moved us all around the country and cared for us while my father and my grandfather served. My mother's job was to create a sense of home in every new place that we moved. Her job was my brother and I.

So there I was with a new baby of my own and a mission to deal with ballistic missile defense, no viable options for childcare, and working within a system that had not yet caught up with me and my career. So I decided to make a very difficult choice, and I separated from the Air Force.

You see, at that time, I didn't really have any role models, anyone that I knew or could look up to who had walked in my boots, so to speak, and had navigated being a new mother while simultaneously serving our country. So few women were really high up in the Air Force's ranks at the time, so there were very few I knew who could show me what Active Duty looked like as a mother.

But that is changing. In 2019, women represent the fastest growing cohort in America's military. More and more women are hearing that same call that I and my friends here heard—the call to serve.

What is upsetting, though, is 27 years later, despite women's increased presence across all branches of the military, we all still struggle with many of the same issues, including access to quality and affordable childcare, and I find this unacceptable.

In this 116th Congress, we set a record. For the first time in history, there are more than two women veterans serving in the House of Representatives. There are now four. It was the realization that I was surrounded by three other women who served our country that inspired me to start this caucus.

Now is the time to address these issues that have been plaguing our servicewomen and women veterans for years, and that is what today is about. That is what the Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus is about.

We four women are here to enact change to better support the brave women who have also answered the call to serve. We four are here as four women veterans who will lead this caucus with our lived experiences in the Armed Forces and who will evaluate the unique issues that our women face and who will work towards enacting

legislation that better serves them and better serves their families.

This is not a Democratic issue nor is it a Republican issue. It is neither a man's issue nor a woman's issue. It is an intrinsically American and human issue, and that is why this caucus has members from both sides of the aisle, and that is why we have veterans and nonveterans as participants, men and women.

This caucus is comprised of people who are held together by a shared understanding that, when Congress neglects its duty to support the men and women who serve, it hasn't done its job. It undermines our country's national security and our military's readiness.

I remember thinking to myself when I got here that I was just one person. Then when I got here, I met Representative TULSI GABBARD, Representative ELAINE LURIA, Representative MIKIE SHERRILL, and the one became four. And now, today, I am launching that Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus, the very first caucus in our country's history to specifically address the issues facing servicewomen and women veterans.

We are more than 50 strong in number now; 1 became 4, and 4 became more than 50. We have a mission. We have our marching orders. And speaking as an Air Force veteran, I can promise I won't stop fighting until our mission has been accomplished.

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

MAKING THE MATH WORK

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. Madam Speaker, this is actually something we try to do about once a week, come in here and actually sort of talk about our unified theory in our office: What do we do to, basically, keep our promises?

Here is a thought experiment.

Social Security and Medicare are two of the greatest fragilities we have in our society because we are getting older very fast. Remember, we have talked about this over and over and over. In about 8½ years, 50 percent of the spending in this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and up.

How do you make the math work? And in an intellectual, lazier time, you would get some that would say: Well, we could raise taxes here or we can do entitlement reform here.

Well, it turns out that math really actually doesn't work anymore. Now, we actually have to do everything to make the math work. So we have been trying to actually sell this concept that it is economic growth, and within economic growth it is how we design our tax system, how we design trade, how we design our regulatory environment, how we actually do population

stability—and this one actually gets complicated.

You saw the article in *The Wall Street Journal* today about what has happened to U.S. birth rates. How do you encourage family formation, but also how do you deal with the immigration system that maximizes a talent-based immigration system to maximize that economic velocity?

Remember, this is about us having a vibrant enough economy so we can keep our promises, but within that, we also have some other issues. How do you do what we call labor force participation?

Countries like Japan and some in Western Europe are dealing with how they get those who are older, and if they are healthy and want to, how they create incentives to actually say: Are you willing to stay in or come back into the labor force?

We actually have this quirky math here in our country of millennial males. In December, we started to see this breakthrough of millennial females entering the workforce. We still actually have a whole bunch of millennial males who are missing in the workforce who should be there. How do we build a society that encourages participation in that labor force?

It turns out, if you actually look at a lot of our economic data, from the Joint Economic Committee to the Joint Committee on Taxation, when they talk about what are the barriers for us to be able to keep growing and continue this actually incredibly robust cycle we are having right now, it is capital stock.

Well, actually, the numbers since tax reform have been dramatically healthier than we modeled for, with folks having savings, and that savings actually becoming lendable capital. You actually can see that in just nationwide interest rates.

The second fragility that was being written about was labor force participation, and we now live in a society where we have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs and no workers. So who would have ever thought a couple years ago you would live in a society with more job openings than available workers?

This is a wonderful problem, but it actually does genuinely become a barrier to economic growth, and it is something we have to find a way to deal with.

Part of this is actually really optimistic, though, as we started to see in the data over the last several months the number of business organizations and others who are taking a chance on people, hiring right out of correctional facilities, making accommodations for our brothers and sisters who may have a personal impairment, a personal handicap; and we actually see that in some of the Social Security disability numbers of individuals actually moving into the labor force.

So, look, this is just our unified theory.

Today, we are actually going to start to talk about technology, which is one of our five pillars, and how aggressive I believe the adoption of technology has to be to keep the economic growth going.

We have done lots of floor time over the last couple months on the healthcare technology, the revolution that I believe, our office believes, some of the people we work with believe, that is about to happen and the ability for you to take care of yourself, the wearables—the kazoo you blow into that instantly tells you if you have the flu, to the other side of the spectrum, the single shot cure for hemophilia—and how do we finance those types of disruptions.

Wouldn't it be amazing if this body were no longer having the, actually, in some ways, insane debate we have had for decades about who gets subsidized, who gets to pay in healthcare, and started actually talking about what we pay and how we are going to cure our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions? We all know, the 5 percent of Americans with those chronic conditions are well over half of our healthcare spending.

So what happens when we actually bring cures to market? And then our obligation: How do we finance them so we roll them out as fast as possible?

But today, we are going to talk about another fixation of mine, and that is environment issues.

I wish I had a more delicate way to talk about this. Often, the discussion around here is almost Malthusian, saying the pie is only so big. If you care about global warming, if you care about greenhouse gases, we must shrink the economy; we must get individuals to drive less; we must generate less power; we must do these types of things.

And a decade or so ago, maybe that was a legitimate view, but they have missed an entire technology revolution that is going on around us, and there should be optimism in this body that, if you are someone who cares about greenhouse gases in our national and world environment, the revolution is here, and it is a technology one.

□ 1815

How does this body start to remove the barriers that have slowed down the adoption of this clean generation, these alternative generations that are in our marketplace? A simple thought: solar generation.

I hope I get this story, which is coming out of New Mexico, correct. They wanted to run a power line to Arizona. They have been working on the power transmission lines for a dozen years.

We have seen the discussion in the upper Midwest. I believe it is Iowa, with wind generation, finally figuring it out and saying maybe we can run the power lines in the railroad right-of-way because we want this power to make it to Illinois. That is where the demand is, and over here is where the clean generation is.

These are things we often don't think about. It is not enough to have the technology. How do you get the power to where it needs to be consumed? We have never fixed the bureaucratic barriers to moving that power.

It is like some of the discussions we have had in our office. A couple of years ago, we did a math experiment. A pipeline in west Texas, a pipeline loop that would capture methane so you didn't have to flare it off, had a really impressive calculation in U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, but it requires permitting a pipeline.

I need us to remove some of our ideological blinders and think of pro-growth, pro-environment, pro-effectiveness. We have to be willing to change the permitting system and so much of the litigation and bureaucracy that slows these things down.

We are going to walk through a couple of these boards, just because I think there is incredible optimism out there.

This one I am sort of thrilled with. This is a chart that talks about battery efficiency. For those of you that geek out on this stuff with me, you probably all saw the article—I think it was April 1—on some new solid-state battery technology. It looks like they finally have a major breakthrough on what we call power density.

This chart here, do you see that coming down? That is the cost of battery storage. It is a remarkable reduction.

In Arizona, we have our largest and best utility, Arizona Public Service. When you read some of the articles that are going on right now with them, the amount of solar that is now in their portfolio, they have baseline nuclear and now the holy grail. What happens when you live in the desert Southwest as I do? I am blessed to live in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. We produce lots of solar.

Into the peak of the afternoon, California now produces so much alternative solar generation that they can't use it all. On some days, they paid Arizona to buy it off them.

What happens when a company like APS gets really creative and says: How do we have solar power at night when, if you live in the Phoenix area, you are still running your air-conditioner into the evening? It turns out the battery investment is about to bring solar generation into the hours it is dark because they will store it. If you design that type of battery storage that holds for about 4 hours, you get us through the peak.

It is referred to as the duck curve. If you see the back of a duck, we have all this production, and then it collapses. Yet, we still have all this demand. How do you cover that gap?

In the past, we used peaking power plants, fire them up to cover those few hours. Now, with what is happening with battery storage, it is here.

Our privately owned utility in Arizona, APS, recently did an RFP or RFQ. The numbers that came back

were remarkably competitive. It is happening.

When on this floor we discuss global warming, greenhouse gases, and what we are going to do in alternative generation, it is here. We just need to understand what is happening right around us.

How do you keep curves like this line continuing? When we are reading that there is a breakthrough in battery technology, how do we remove barriers so that technology rolls out and becomes part of what we do here in the United States and around the world?

Here is something else. I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee. Last year, we updated a tax credit mechanism for carbon sequestration. It turns out that we have multiple facilities now that were an experiment, but they are growing. They are about to go to large-scale commercial where they capture all the carbon.

This first one, I believe this is the NET Power facility outside Houston. It is a natural gas-fired facility, so they are using a hydrocarbon and they have no smokestack. They capture not only the manmade CO₂, but they even capture any other gas throw-off.

The remarkable design is that they throw a little oxygen. They heat it up, and heat it really, really hot. They use that to spin the turbines. Then they cool it down and pull out the CO₂ and then use that to sell for other purposes. They don't have a smokestack.

This technology is up and running today. The proof of concept is done. Now we are heading toward, I believe, a fairly substantial expansion in the scale of the facility.

This was research that has been going on for years. Those of us here in this body, a year ago, we updated the carbon sequestration tax credits. It is paying off.

The next one is another facility that is also in Texas. This one was really an interesting experiment because, in many ways, it broke through a bit of folklore.

It sits right next to an existing coal-fired generation facility. It is a coal-fired carbon capture plant. They are spinning the turbines, burning coal, and they capture the carbon.

It was only 2 or 3 years ago when we had witnesses around here saying this sort of technology would not work. It is up and running today.

There should be joy and optimism around this place because the ability to basically say, for the hydrocarbons we have, what happens if we can use them to help us through this transition of time and we are capturing the CO₂? This is wonderful.

Let's go even further. If we are going to continue the thought experiment, you have already seen the United States do some pretty remarkable reductions. Most of it has come from natural gas, but there have been some pretty remarkable reductions in our CO₂ production.

A lot of the rest of the world hasn't even come close. For the number of

new coal-fired plants moving in Southeast Asia, part of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, they are not going to have the types of capture technology we have here in the United States.

We have to have a worldwide strategy. I am one of those who has been really excited because I have been following a facility that is going up in Canada. It looks like they have succeeded in the breakthrough of mining the air to pull CO₂ out of it. Mathematically, we had lots of smart people saying this is absurd, that you are not going to be able to do it.

We had a very smart professor in Arizona at Arizona State University who had been working on sort of a carbon capture artificial tree. This technology is rolling out. It is under production right now, and they are moving up to industrial scale. The amazing thing is, they think they can do it for about \$100 a ton, which is remarkable if you have actually played the math game. This is for the new facility.

What happens if they start to break that curve? If you understand that carbon that has been captured, to have the ability to refine it and do other things, even make another fuel source out of it?

The other thing is, think about the article we hopefully all saw last week about what the Dutch are doing. The Dutch are basically about to take a depleted oil field and take carbon that they have captured and shove it back in the ground and sequester it.

All of a sudden, it is a negative calculation. In this place, in a lot of the debate, for a lot of the witnesses we have had in previous years, the concept of mining and having negative emissions was considered absurd. It is here. The technology is here.

This is a facility that has, apparently, really smart, really wealthy people investing in it because they are so excited about the technology. We need to understand that there is optimism out here.

How do we get ourselves up to date on the cutting-edge technology? How do we move it forward and promote it?

We also need to understand that the theater that we engage in here often is not good math. I wish I had a more recent date, but the latest we could find is 2015 on this.

Do you see the yellow bar on the side? That is all the photovoltaic solar that rolled out in 2015. It was an impressive year. There were fairly aggressive subsidies, State, local, and Federal.

Do you see the other bar chart next to it? That was all the nuclear that went offline that year.

The reality of it is, in 2015, if you were thinking about power generation in the United States that did not produce CO₂ and you were joyful that this much solar hit the grid, understand that almost the equal amount of nuclear came off the grid. We were peddling in place.

We need to be honest about the math, and we need to be honest about that

baseload nuclear being really, really important if you care about this issue.

There are a couple of quirky things I wanted to throw out here. This one is just fun. It is sort of an odd thought experiment.

In the desert Southwest and mountain Southwest, uranium mining has always been a dodgy issue. We need it. We know we need it. We need it for everything from our X-rays to refining and refining for a nuclear power plant.

In previous decades, we have been able to take very high grades and step it down, but that was some of the excess that was out there after the Cold War. That stock has been substantially used up. So what are we going to do?

There is a technology breakthrough of mining seawater for uranium. We should be joyful and pushing these technologies. They solve some of the moving problem of wanting nuclear generation but where are we going to get the uranium? How are we going to step it up? It turns out, even on that, the technology has moved forward.

Look at other little thought experiments. How many of us in high school with Popular Science magazine used to get excited about how you generate power from ocean waves? It turns out that a new design is rolling out. It is sort of a bobbing power generation. It exists now, and it works. It is much more robust than anything that has ever been designed.

We should be joyful and trying to promote more of this type of technology, but we have to deal with how you bring the power in from the shore. All of a sudden, you have a whole other layer of regs, rules, and permitting.

You want clean power. We all want it, but we have to deal with the bureaucratic malaise, mess, and blocks that stop us from being able to pull this type of new power generation into our communities and our country.

What is exciting about that is that is a type of power generation that, if we make it work, it can be all over the world. Being someone who, as a younger man, trekked Indonesia, Vietnam, lots of India, and Sri Lanka, think about most of the world's population living near coastal communities. Wouldn't that be exciting?

Why aren't we promoting these types of technologies? We need to get rid of this Malthusian mindset that the pie is only so big, that we can cut it only so many ways, that once you cut it those ways, there is never an opportunity for it to grow.

There are still people who believe that the 1968 book "The Population Bomb" was real. The only thing they got accurate was the author's name.

□ 1830

We need to understand there is a technology breakthrough happening around us, in particularly power generation. But if you want to have a revolution—and I am sort of banking on being one of the first people to talk

about this because this one is really disruptive, but it is worth the thought experiment.

For anyone who might be watching or having an interest in this Google, “photosynthesis 40 percent”. Read the complete articles that have been written.

Madam Speaker, you remember your high school biology class talking about plants and plant cells having a certain inherent inefficiency, where there is a flaw that has been there for millions and millions of years where it reaches out and grabs the oxygen molecule when it should have grabbed the carbon molecule.

Through some synthetic biology they fixed the inefficiency. It now will reach over and grab the carbon molecule every time. All of a sudden it means a 40 percent efficiency in growth.

So, what happens tomorrow when crops require 40 percent less water, 40 percent less land, and 40 percent less fuel?

What does it mean to the world?

Thought experiment: I need you to take it a step further. World agriculture represents 2.2 times the total greenhouse gases of every automobile on Earth. Just adopting this plant technology in our agriculture equals removing every car off the face of the Earth.

As this rolls out, how fast would it take to change the seed stock around the world?

There are solutions, and they are not always a linear thought. They sometimes require some creativity. Let's face it. We work in a math-free zone that also lacks creativity. This exists. This is rolling out. It is a revolution.

Yes, it is going to be incredibly disruptive to agriculture around the world. It is going to be incredibly disruptive.

At the same time, what happens when you want to plant trees and you can grow them 40 percent more efficiently, and they are just little carbon capture machines?

This is here. We should be excited about it.

The last one is just more of the thought experiment of trying to say, if we really care, we need to stop the theater that seems to be what happens behind these microphones and actually understand the problem, understand the math, and then focus on that solution. Because often around here I believe a solution is a problem for us because the very thing that we got elected on, that we love coming and complaining about, oh, dear heaven, what happens if we solve it?

So let's actually talk about something that is part of our pop culture right now, but it is a real issue. For someone like myself, I grew up scuba diving. I love scuba diving, and I have been blessed to do it in a lot of really neat places. Ninety percent of the plastic in the world's oceans come from 10 rivers. Eight of these rivers are in Asia, and two of those rivers are in Africa.

Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers. If you give a darn about plastic in the ocean, banning straws in your community is theater. It is absurd math. It may make you feel better and get you in the local newspaper, but you didn't do anything.

This body here immediately should figure out what aid programs we have, what research, what we can do to go to those 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean and help, instead of complaining about it and instead of doing a nice video of going out and saying, I am going to pick up plastic off a beach.

No. If you care, it is 10 rivers, we know where the problem is. If you really want to have an impact, go where it is coming from. This is a simple example of we talk, talk, talk, talk, and talk around this place, but if we solve it, then we don't get to actually talk about it. But solving is the most ethical thing we can do as a body.

Policy that is made with math and policy that is made with facts can do amazing things for our country, my 3-year-old little girl, and for this world. Policy around here that is done by folklore, by an anecdote, and by feelings, time and time again, when we look back, it may have been well-intended, but ultimately it hurts people.

If we get our math right, if we actually understand the underlying basis of a problem, figure out an honest solution that continues to grow our economy and continues to provide opportunities instead of this sort of constant Malthusian echo around here that says that we can't grow anymore, we can't do this—they are wrong, and the folks who embrace that philosophy have been wrong for centuries now.

There are technology breakthroughs happening all around us. You actually saw the latest one on this. Finally, we have broken the code on a plastic that truly breaks down. Let's incentivize that. There are solutions. This body is an honorable body, but it needs to become one about solutions instead of theatrics.

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

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2019.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), and H. Res. 293 (116th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2020 published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for program integrity initiatives and Overseas Contingency Operations

pursuant to section 251(b) of BBEDCA. These amounts are contained respectively in the text of H.R. 2740, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020, and of H.R. 2745, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2020 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2020. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	2020	2020–2029
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,709,585	n.a.
Outlays	3,676,452	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 2740):		
Budget Authority	1,842	n.a.
Outlays	1,481	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 2745):		
Budget Authority	921	n.a.
Outlays	7	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,712,348	n.a.
Outlays	3,677,940	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2021 through 2029 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

	2020
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,295,018
OT	1,360,935
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 2740):	
BA	1,842
OT	1,481
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 2745):	
BA	921
OT	7
Revised Allocation:	
BA	1,297,781
OT	1,362,423
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	1,075,820
OT	1,067,358

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1026. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a semi-annual report titled,

"Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608(i); Public Law 101-403, title II, Sec. 202(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1105(b)); (107 Stat. 1750); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1027. A letter from the Under Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting annual audit of the American Red Cross's consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2018, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 300110(b); Public Law 105-225, Sec. 300110(b); (112 Stat. 1493); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1028. A letter from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1029. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1030. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by federal employees for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1031. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1032. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed by employees for fiscal year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1033. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a letter submitted to amend Sec. 661 of the Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

1034. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, Small Business, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Science, Space, and Technology.

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:

Ms. DeLAURO: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2745. A bill making

appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-63). 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. ROUDA (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit certain rolling stock procurements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. McEACHIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 2741. A bill to rebuild and modernize the Nation's infrastructure to expand access to broadband and Next Generation 9-1-1, rehabilitate drinking water infrastructure, modernize the electric grid and energy supply infrastructure, redevelop brownfields, strengthen health care infrastructure, create jobs, and protect public health and the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BUDD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. LATTI, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that amounts paid for an abortion are not taken into account for purposes of the deduction for medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio):

H.R. 2743. A bill to repeal the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. McCAUL (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2744. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which programs of the agency are identified overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. YOHIO):

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PALONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2747. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MENG, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2748. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal Governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 2749. A bill to prohibit forced arbitration in work disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. RESCENHALER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2750. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code to prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of certain disputes arising from claims of servicemembers and veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. HAALAND, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2751. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by doulas and midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 2752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2753. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require certain consumer reporting agencies to include a credit score when providing consumers with a free annual consumer report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HECK, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2754. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require paper ballots and risk limiting audits in all Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. SOTO, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2755. A bill to standardize and extend certain Buy America provisions; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself and Mr. BANKS):

H.R. 2756. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop workforce development investment incentives and to consider a qualified training program of an offeror as part of the past performance rating of such offeror, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2757. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for adjustments to the Medicare part D cost-sharing reductions for low-income individuals; 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 Ms. DELAULO (for herself and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 2758. A bill to provide disaster relief assistance to individuals for the purpose of clearing fallen debris, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 2759. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to enhance the readiness of the Department of Defense to challenges relating to climate change and to improve the energy and resource efficiency of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2760. A bill to further deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1 to enhance and upgrade the 9-1-1 systems of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. FLETCHER (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FLORES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2761. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to immediately release certain grant funds awarded for mitigation activities under the Community Development Block Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VELA, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 2762. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the modification and clarification of construction authority in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 2763. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing certain rules; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 2764. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to create a national zero-emission vehicle standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2765. A bill to allow qualified current or former law enforcement officers to purchase their service weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 2766. A bill to nullify certain memorandum of the Office of Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service regarding the application of the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers to certain chassis renovations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 2767. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for eating disorders treatment for members and certain former members of the uniformed services, and dependents of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2768. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to allow the release of

education records to facilitate the award of a recognized postsecondary credential; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2769. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to permit the Council of the District of Columbia to enact laws with respect to the organization and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COOPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2770. A bill to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 2771. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to revise regulations with respect to payment rates for durable medical equipment 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 Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 2772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a mid-decade census of population for the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require coverage without a deductible of certain primary care services by high deductible health plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PARNETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms.

CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 2775. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to ensure protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth and their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2776. A bill to make certain municipalities eligible for grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 2777. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect coverage for screening mammography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a special enrollment period for pregnant women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Reform, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution requiring congressional approval prior to engaging in hostilities within the sovereign country of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to make an invaluable contribution to United States and international security, and noting former Senator Richard G. Lugar's indispensable contributions to international security and reducing nuclear weapons-related risks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 383. A resolution expressing support for recognizing the week of May 13 through May 19, 2019 as "National Police Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 384. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway to be enjoyed by all in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

50. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 3, urging the Congress of the United States to enact the IDEA Full Funding Act, which would fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. ROUDA:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 2743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2744.

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. KIND:

H.R. 2746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 2752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section IV, Clause I

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 2756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 2767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 2758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 2759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 2760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. FLETCHER:

H.R. 2761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

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. GALLEG0:

H.R. 2762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 2763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 2764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 2765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 2766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 2767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 2768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 2771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the understanding and interpretation of the Commerce Clause, Congress has authority to enact this legislation in accordance with Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 2, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 2775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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.

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 2776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 2777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

Article I, Section 8, clause 14

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 2778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.J. Res. 58.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 95: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 141: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 158: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 249: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 250: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 275: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. CRAIG, and Ms. BARRAGAN.

H.R. 285: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 307: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 336: Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 372: Mr. VEASEY and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 444: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 500: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 535: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 553: Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 554: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 594: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 613: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 647: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 663: Mr. COOPER, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 677: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 692: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma and Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 693: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 717: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 720: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 748: Mr. STEIL, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. EVANS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 803: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. LATTI.

H.R. 849: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 865: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 873: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 874: Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 877: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 884: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 887: Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 913: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 925: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 929: Mr. CROW, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 983: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1024: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 1030: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1055: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1139: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1140: Mr. TONKO, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1155: Ms. DEAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1171: Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1200: Mr. KIND and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. CRAIG, and Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 1220: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1257: Mr. COX of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1287: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1309: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1326: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1327: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1370: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1379: Mr. CROW, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 1411: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1415: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1417: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1423: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1450: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1485: Mr. HIMES, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1527: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1622: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1629: Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 1636: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1641: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1668: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1680: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1696: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 1705: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1709: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1741: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 1753: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1754: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1770: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BACON, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1781: Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 1830: Mr. BOST, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1832: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1846: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIMES, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1851: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 1873: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1903: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1910: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1948: Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1959: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1965: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1978: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1979: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1982: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1992: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1994: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 2009: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2010: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2015: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2042: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2053: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2088: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2091: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2093: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HECK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2096: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2113: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2123: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2148: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2149: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2150: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2151: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2164: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2167: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 2178: Mr. DELGADO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 2180: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2213: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2214: Ms. PORTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2219: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2231: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2247: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2249: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 2255: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 2262: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2266: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 2319: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2329: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2334: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 2335: Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 2340: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2348: Mr. EVANS and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2349: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2352: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 2354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2377: Mr. KIM, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 2382: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BRINDISI, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. AXNE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2388: Mr. CRIST and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2402: Mr. CRIST, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2410: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2415: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2428: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2430: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2439: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2441: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 2457: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2474: Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2480: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2481: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 2482: Mr. WATKINS, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Ms. DELAURIO.

H.R. 2483: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 2508: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2516: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2525: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2534: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2561: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2570: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2585: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2591: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2602: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2615: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 2619: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2634: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2635: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2649: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 2655: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2656: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2662: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2692: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2733: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 23: Ms. WILD and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 45: Mrs. CRAIG.

H. Res. 60: Ms. WILD.

H. Res. 138: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 152: Ms. LOFGREN and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 220: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 221: Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 222: Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H. Res. 246: Mr. CLINE, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 259: Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. WELCH.

H. Res. 276: Mr. STANTON.

H. Res. 277: Mr. CASE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 326: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 354: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. MILLER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CRAIG, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 369: Mr. BEYER and Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 372: Mr. CUMMINGS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative PALLONE or a designee to H.R. 987 the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Cost Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.