

Steube	Trone	Watson Coleman
Stevens	Turner	Weber (TX)
Stewart	Underwood	Webster (FL)
Stivers	Upton	Welch
Suozi	Van Drew	Wenstrup
Takano	Vargas	Westerman
Taylor	Veasey	Wexton
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Williams
Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Timmons	Walberg	Wittman
Tipton	Walden	Womack
Titus	Walker	Woodall
Tlaib	Walorski	Wright
Tonko	Waltz	Yarmuth
Torres (CA)	Wasserman	Yoho
Torres Small	Schultz	Young
(NM)	Waters	Zeldin
Trahan	Watkins	

## NOES—3

Arrington	Bergman	Davidson (OH)
-----------	---------	---------------

## NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (UT)	González-Colón	Norton
Clyburn	(PR)	Radewagen
Crenshaw	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Cummings	Herrera Beutler	San Nicolas
Emmer	Jeffries	Swalwell (CA)
	Kirkpatrick	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1104

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chair, on roll call no. 398, I mistakenly voted "no" when I intended to vote "yes".

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I was absent today due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: yea on rollcall No. 396; yea on rollcall No. 397; and yea on rollcall No. 398.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY of the Appropriations Committee, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SHALALA) having assumed the chair, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate, and 2 p.m. for

legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

Members are advised that debate on amendments to H.R. 3055, the appropriations bill, could begin as early as 3 p.m. on Monday.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, and 12 p.m. for legislative business. Again, we will meet at 10 a.m. Tuesday and Wednesday.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by close of business today.

The House will consider consideration of the appropriations bill, H.R. 3055, which entails Commerce, Justice, Science, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2020.

The House will also consider H.R. 3551, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2020. That will be the tenth appropriations bill that we will consider and is another step toward the House doing its work to avoid a shutdown at the end of the fiscal year.

The House will also consider H.R. 2722, Securing America's Federal Elections Act. This legislation will protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections.

□ 1115

Lastly, additional legislative items may also be considered, including legislation related to humanitarian assistance at the border and the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know the gentleman and I have been having the conversation for well over a month now about this crisis at the border. I am glad to hear that there is the possibility, maybe the likelihood, that there will be legislation coming to the floor to address the crisis.

I am also aware, as the gentleman is, that the Senate did just pass legislation out of committee to address the crisis. It was a 30-1 vote, a very bipartisan vote, to address the crisis.

In fact, I know that the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, worked closely with the White House to get to a point where, while they don't completely agree on all the details, it seems clear that the White House would be able to have this bill signed by the President, which, again, addresses the crisis before it becomes imminent shutdown.

There was a letter sent just days ago, and Secretary Azar has been making it very clear how serious of a crisis this is, literally to the point where they are about to run out of money to take care of young children who are coming over illegally, many of whom have serious health problems.

They want to take care of these kids. They are properly taking care of these kids, but they are about to run out of money to take care of these kids.

They just sent an Antideficiency Act notice, which means they basically are out of money that has been appropriated by Congress. It would be a violation of the law to spend any money after they have run out of money appropriated by Congress. Under this act, they can spend money in violation of that law if it is to preserve life and safety. They are at that critical of a point.

I make all of these points just to ask the gentleman: As we look at the Senate bill, while it might not be ideal, it can be signed by the President. We haven't seen any details of what my friend is working on right now. I am not sure how closely the gentleman has been working with the White House. Has the gentleman been working with the White House to come up with a bill that can actually be signed by the President in time to avert this crisis before they run out of money in a matter of days?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me say that I am pleased that the gentleman refers to the Antideficiency Act and that, in this instance, the administration will not spend money on an object that was not designated for by the Congress of the United States. This is for helping children.

Obviously, when it wanted to build a wall, it did exactly that. It tried to shift money that was not appropriated for. I am glad that, in this instance, we are honoring it, number one.

Number two, let me say that I think the Senate's action was helpful. It was, as the gentleman pointed out, bipartisan. I think that will probably be helpful to us here as well.

I want to say to the gentleman that I know for a fact that, certainly within the Appropriations Committee, there have been bipartisan discussions all along. There was a time when they were very close to agreement on what the bill would comprise.

It is my hope that as a result of both these actions, as I said, my expectation is that we will pass something next week. That is my hope, and I know that work is being done on it as we speak. I know it will be done over the weekend, and I am hopeful that we will get there because this humanitarian relief for the children and for adults, for giving the proper treatment to people who are in our country and in our care, is very important, and we are working very hard to get that done. My hope is that it will be done.

Mr. SCALISE. I just can't urge enough that as these conversations are happening and as this work is going on over the weekend that it is work not just among Democrat appropriators and Democrat leadership but that the

majority is working with Republicans as well and with the White House as well because we have been hearing that there may be some of what would be considered poison pills that might be added.

There are things that the agency is doing. For example, HHS is trying to find more places to house these children. They have over 13,000 children in their custody right now, in their care, and they want to take care of them. They need the money to take care of them. They are literally days away from running out of money to take care of them.

This is the midnight hour, but it is not the midnight hour because they just dropped it. This has been known for over a month. They have been asking for this money for over a month. They are days away from running out.

If this becomes a game where only a partisan bill is brought to the floor with poison pills that everybody knows the White House can't support, when we have seen the Senate take action with a 30-1 vote on a bill that the President can support, if a bill comes out of the House that does have those kinds of poison pills and limits the ability of the agency—not on the wall.

We are not even talking about all the other problems with the border and things that are causing so many people to come over illegally. We still have to deal with that. Now we are just talking about taking care of these kids.

The Senate proved that they can pass a bill in a very bipartisan way that can be signed by the President. We need to be working not just among Democrats but among Republicans with the White House on a bill the President can sign because if we don't pass a bill by the end of next week—the gentleman from Maryland makes the schedule. He knows the schedule. We are not here on July Fourth recess. Once we leave next week, if we don't have a bill that the President can sign passed through the House and through the Senate, they go into shutdown mode. They will literally be in shutdown mode after the July Fourth recess.

The employees of HHS will not get paid. They will have to be finding money to feed these young kids, over 13,000 of them, with moneys that are not appropriated by Congress. They will be out of money.

I appreciate that the gentleman has a group working on a bill, but I can't urge enough that this bill has to be bipartisan and in a way that the President can sign by the time we leave next week. If we go to conference because the House passes a partisan bill when the Senate proved that they can come together and pass a very bipartisan bill 30-1 out of committee that the President will sign—we have to be working on that same track.

Otherwise, if we leave next week without a bill that is signed by the President, they go into shutdown. Those 13,000-plus kids who are being treated will be being treated by HHS

employees who won't be getting paid and with money to feed them and take care of their healthcare needs from who knows what account.

There is no money left. Again, this isn't a new problem. This has been known for over a month. We have been urging action.

I would just urge that while the work is being done over the weekend, can we get an assurance that it will be done in a way that we will be working with the White House like the Senate did, Republicans and Democrats, a 30-1 vote out of committee, that kind of approach as opposed to an approach that might include some poison pills that everybody knows then poison the well where it won't be signed by the President?

I yield to the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I understand that this is a critical issue that we need to address, but I believe that the gentleman is not accurate.

HHS employees are going to get paid. This money that is being appropriated is for the special, additional services that we need to make sure are available. I don't think there is a question of HHS employees not getting paid.

More importantly, it is an issue as to whether or not the services are going to be available to provide the humanitarian treatment that the gentleman talks about, and I think we are in full agreement.

I will say again that I think the Senate's action is helpful. It was bipartisan. Very frankly, I think it, hopefully, is going to help us get to some bipartisan agreement here.

Frankly, I will tell the gentleman, we thought we were pretty close to a bipartisan agreement with the Republicans, and the Republicans and Democrats have been working on this in the committee, as the gentleman knows. We were pretty close to agreement. We didn't get there.

They got to it in the Senate, which meant the Democrats went along with what the majority could support because they are the majority. Hopefully, we can do that here and get a bipartisan bill.

I will tell the gentleman that I am working very hard and am very focused on getting a bill done so that we do not leave here without a bill having been passed to provide this humanitarian relief that is so essential.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for that commitment because I know that our teams will be talking. The leadership teams will be talking and working, hopefully, completely together in a way where, when we look at the Senate bill, there are components of the Senate bill that I would prefer not be in there, and I know there are things that the White House would rather not have in that bill, but there is give-and-take.

There has been give-and-take, and it has gotten to a point where they at

least recognize that, with the things that they might not want, there are no poison pills in it. At least it gives them the tools they need so that the agency can take care of those 13,700-plus kids who are here.

We can talk all day about why a mother and father would send their 12-year-old daughter on a journey from another country into America, but it is happening. When they come here, they need to be properly taken care of, and that money is literally about to run out in days.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I want to make a comment on what the gentleman just said.

I think most of us are parents. I have had three 12-year-old daughters. All were 12 years of age at one point in time, and I wouldn't send them unless I thought their lives were at risk, unless I thought they were in great danger by remaining with me, unless I thought the alternative of staying was worse than the risk.

That is why they come here, because they are terrified that their child is going to be taken from them by death, not by trying to get to an America that is the light of the world, that they think is the land of opportunity. That is why they come here. That is why they take this risk.

Very frankly, we should have passed comprehensive immigration reform a long time ago so that there was a safe route and an open door and so that people seeking refuge and asylum, which is under American law, would be able to do that.

I agree. Sending these children has to be wrenching for a parent. But the alternative they find to be even more wrenching, more dangerous, and riskier for that 12-year-old child, and so they send them here. They send them here because the reputation of America is that we will treat people humanely, thoughtfully, and safely. And it is our responsibility to do that.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that, and obviously, when you see that somebody would send their child—let's use Guatemala as an example because they are one of the countries where a lot of these young children are coming from. They went through Mexico. Mexico offered them asylum, and they turned that down and, ultimately, came to America.

I appreciate the fact that people look to America as that beacon of freedom. We are the beacon of freedom for a lot of reasons.

One of the reasons is because we are a nation of freedom and laws. We are a nation of laws, and we need to find a way to get back to the rule of law so that we can have an immigration system that works for everybody, not just for the people who come over one way but for the people who follow the rule of law to come here legally.

Millions of people are waiting today to come to this great country and ultimately will become part of the American Dream. They will add to the richness and greatness of our Nation.

But as those 12-year-old children are coming over, they are right now in the custody of HHS because of our laws. But under our law, they are literally running out of money.

The HHS Secretary sent a letter to all of us over a week ago. In that letter, he said that our valued Federal employees in ORR who care for children and place them with sponsors would be required to work without pay. That is from the Secretary of HHS. Under the law, his employees would be required to work without pay if we break by the end of next week without an agreement that is signed by the President to properly fund the agency that is taking care of these 13,700-plus kids. That was from the letter Secretary Azar and Secretary McAleenan, the Acting Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, sent to every Member of Congress over a week ago.

The agency has told us what the crisis is. They have told us they are about to run out of money. They have sent the Antideficiency Act notice to make it clear that under the law, if they run out of money, the only money they can spend is for life and safety of those kids, and they are going to be doing that.

But we can prevent that from happening. We need to prevent that from happening.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to correct myself. The gentleman was correct. I have just been informed because they are funded, the employees, specifically under that account, the gentleman is correct and I was incorrect, and apparently, they would not be paid.

Obviously, the general Labor-Health bill that we passed up until September 30 of this year funds almost all employees. But apparently, because these funds are segregated in this account, my friend is correct that they would not be paid.

In any event, while I am concerned, and maybe some of those folks live in my district, while I am concerned about them being paid, I, frankly, share my friend's concern, which is a much greater concern, that people who come here under and consistent with U.S. law, seeking asylum from the danger that they face at home, need to be treated in a humanitarian way. So I certainly agree that we want to make sure people get paid.

We shut down the government for 35 days, and 400,000 people did not get paid. Actually, 800,000 did not get paid, and 400,000 people had to work.

□ 1130

We offered numerous bills which, very frankly, the gentleman's party

voted against on a regular basis, which would have opened up the government and paid those employees. So, I wish we had been more concerned, during those 35 days, with them getting paid.

But the real concern—and I know the gentleman and I share this view—is the humanitarian treatment of the people who are here in our care.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman and I need to and, hopefully, will work closely together—not isolated, but together—over the weekend to come up with a bill to solve this problem, recognizing that the Senate is going to, hopefully, move their own bill that, while flawed, does address the basic needs, so that those children can be taken care of and the employees can be paid, and we can come together and get a bill done by the end of next week.

The urgency of getting it done by the end of next week can't be understated because, after that, they have made it very clear they do run out of money. It is not a new issue. It is not something that is thrown at us at the midnight hour. For more than a month this has been identified.

So, I appreciate that we are going to work to get it done. Let's make sure we do work to get it done.

I know there are a lot of other issues we can talk about: the appropriations process, the need to come together on an agreement on what the proper levels of spending are and should be, that the President would also agree with us on, so that we can be writing appropriations bills that would actually have the chance to get signed into law and prevent a shutdown, that kind of impasse, by the end of September.

This is the emergency, immediate need. There are other things that we need to keep working on, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the coming days and weeks to address those problems as well.

If the gentleman has anything else, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I would just say, as the gentleman knows because I have talked to him about it, I have been trying to get an agreement on caps since January.

I talked to Senator MCCONNELL; I talked to Senator SHELBY; I talked to Ranking Member GRANGER; obviously, Mrs. LOWEY, the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee.

I have worked almost ceaselessly on trying to get a caps deal, which I think all of us think is absolutely essential.

Very frankly, I think there are those down at the White House—and I specifically reference the Acting Chief of Staff, Mr. Mulvaney—who believed that a caps deal was not the policy they thought ought to be proceeded on and would have preferred and talked about having either a sequester, which I think neither side thinks would make much sense, either on the defense side or the nondefense side—but that a CR was a preferred alternative and, frankly, a negotiation at the very latest moment was a strategy.

I witnessed that, as the gentleman knows, the Republican Senators tried to negotiate with the White House so that the Republican White House and the Republican Senators tried to negotiate a caps deal and could not. So, it had nothing to do with Democratic participation at that point in time.

Now, what we have done, as the gentleman knows, is we have, in effect, adopted a level of spending to which we have marked our bills. That level of spending, I will tell you, on the defense side, I have reason to believe is agreeable to many Republican leaders at the top level on the gentleman's side.

The domestic level of spending was consistent with the raise in defense and domestic, as we have done in prior deals.

The prior, most recent deal, as the gentleman knows, was reached between Speaker Ryan and Senator MURRAY. I would be hopeful that we would reach such a deal.

Obviously, if the gentleman reaches a deal, the President has to be part of that, because you have got to amend the sequester law by statute, and the President has to sign it.

But we are moving ahead. This is our alternative. We are going to be passing 10, 11 of our bills, we hope, next week, and we will send them over to the Senate.

The Senate will, presumably, at some point in time, act upon its bills. If there is a different number, we will have to reconcile the numbers, in conference, in the regular order, and hopefully pass those bills in time so that there will not either be the necessity for a continuing resolution, which really is a recognition of the failure to get the appropriations process done, which has happened often on both sides of the aisle, so it is not a question of just—but, that the Congress has not reached agreement, as it should have.

So, we are proceeding. We are proceeding in a timely fashion. We are going to send at least 10 or 11 bills to the Senate, and we will send the Homeland Security bill, hopefully, at some point in time, or reach agreement between the two parties, and the two houses, so that I think we have done everything we could possibly do, absent the ability of, frankly, the gentleman's side to get agreement among itself on what the gentleman thinks the cap numbers ought to be.

I was hoping, in discussion with Senator MCCONNELL, that between the two parties we could reach agreement, but that has not happened. But, hopefully, at some point in time it will happen soon because, ultimately, it has to happen, because the sequester is not an option, and the CR ought not to be an option either.

We are doing our work, considering amendments. We are in the regular order. This is the way it should be done. I am proud that it is being done this way, and I am hopeful that it will result in agreement and a signature on appropriation bills by the President, so

we do not shut down the government or have to operate under a CR.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, the political differences between the parties are not mutually exclusive to Republicans. Clearly, we have had ours within the Budget Committee.

Now that you are in the majority, the Democrats on the Budget Committee could not come to an agreement amongst themselves about how to get a budget, which is why the Democrat majority, the gentleman's Democrat majority, didn't pass a budget. The first time in 9 years that the Budget Committee hasn't produced a budget out of committee.

We produced all 8 years we were in the majority. We had differences, clearly, and some of those were well written about in the press, but we ultimately came together and passed our budgets, every year of the 8 years, out of committee.

Many of those not only got through the floor but went into law. Sometimes we got those 2-year budget agreements so we didn't need the second year.

This is the time to be working on negotiating our differences. I am glad we are having these conversations on finding out if we can get to a caps deal.

Even the Acting Chief of Staff, Mr. Mulvaney, who was mentioned, would like to get a 2-year deal. I am sure he has some things he would like in a deal that the gentleman wouldn't agree to, but that is going to be negotiated. That is why we have negotiations in June, not in September when it is the midnight hour.

So, I am glad we are having these talks now. Of course we have differences within our parties, the gentleman's party and mine. Ultimately, amongst ourselves, we will have differences, but the ideal objective is that we come together well before the September 30 deadline.

That is why it is important that these discussions are being held now, not in September, so that we can hopefully get that agreement and then write appropriations bills.

I think the gentleman knows, the bills that he is moving through the process this week, next week, are not bills that will be signed into law, not only because, in many cases, the spending levels are well above what we would agree to but, also, the many poison pill amendments that will ultimately get worked out in a conference committee. They won't be in a final product.

But let's at least try to get in agreement on a caps deal. We are in a time frame where, at least, it is responsible to have these differences earlier, not later, in the fiscal year.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, it is interesting the gentleman says these bills aren't going to become law.

That had no restraint on the gentleman's side of the aisle when that side was in charge in the appropriations

bills the gentleman passed in a totally partisan fashion, I would observe.

We didn't think they would get past the Senate. They didn't get past the Senate. They didn't become law. There was a compromise made.

The gentleman did the same thing. Why? Because the gentleman thought that was, from a policy standpoint, the correct thing to do.

We are doing exactly the same thing. Will we have negotiations between the House and the Senate as to levels of spending and other, as the gentleman points out, provisions in the bills? Of course we will.

But the assertion that: Why are you passing bills? They won't pass the Senate. I would hope they pass the Senate. I think they are excellent bills. I think they provide for the national security, both on the defense side and on the domestic side.

Very frankly, we put defense and labor-health together. Why? Because the gentleman had made that a way to proceed.

Why did the gentleman make it a way to proceed? Because those on the other side, for the most part, are hesitant to vote for the levels that we expect are necessary for education and the health of our people.

Having said that, when the gentleman says it won't pass the Senate, the gentleman's bills didn't pass the Senate. The gentleman passed them because he thought they were good policy. We are passing them because we think they are good policy.

And I, frankly, think, but for the fact that I think the gentleman has expressed a policy on his side of, "Don't vote for these bills," we would have gotten a significant number of Republican votes on a number of these bills. We did get some votes.

But let us hope that we get to a deal on what the spending levels ought to be. And, as I point out, without any Democratic participation, the Republican Senators can't get a level with the White House. They tried. They worked at it. It was publicly reported.

The gentleman has been unable to get an agreement within his own party on those levels. My view is, I think Mr. Mulvaney doesn't want a deal. Mr. SCALISE says he wants a 2-year deal. I hope he is right. I hope the gentleman is right that Mr. Mulvaney will, with Mr. Mnuchin, come to grips with doing a 2-year deal to give us some degree of stability.

The gentleman is correct. He didn't have to get a budget because we made a 2-year deal. It couldn't have gotten through the Senate if we hadn't agreed on it. But we made a 2-year deal. It wasn't exactly at the levels we wanted.

Senator MURRAY led that negotiation on our behalf. We reached it, and we had some degree of stability. And that is why the other side was able to pass their bills without a budget, because we already had a number. They didn't need a 302a number.

Now we are getting into jargon here, but suffice it to say, yes, we are pass-

ing bills at levels we think are appropriate. Many on the gentleman's side disagree with that. The Senate may disagree.

The way we get to a resolution is we have a conference and we come to an agreement. Hopefully, that will happen, and we will not shut down the government of the United States, which we did, partially, for 35 days. That is the way this institution ought to work, and I hope it does work that way.

Mr. SCALISE. I do appreciate this is part of the process. And, again, I say the reason that it is good that we are having these talks now is because, as we have our differences—the gentleman within his own party, the gentleman with us, us with the Senate, maybe with the White House—we have time to work that out now, and we don't wait until mid-September, late September, to try to get that kind of agreement.

So, we will continue to have these discussions. I am glad we are having these discussions at this early point so that it is not midnight-hour discussions like we were talking about on the supplemental.

Final point: I wanted to just commend the gentleman. We had a very good meeting yesterday, our two leadership teams, with the Canadian Prime Minister.

Mr. Trudeau was here to talk to us about a number of things. Of course, USMCA is the most imminent and most up-front issue. Mexico just passed the agreement.

I know we are having discussions to see if we can find a path forward for the House to move USMCA and get a better deal with our partners, both on the south and north, Canada and Mexico.

They loaned us Lord Stanley's cup. We are going to loan them the NBA trophy for a little while. But, beyond those trade issues, we do, I think, have some common ground on some trade issues that had been needed to be resolved for a long time.

I know we are going to continue to have those discussions, Mr. HOYER with the White House, to hopefully get to a point where we can, then, get that agreement in place. But I do appreciate that we had a very productive, bipartisan meeting with the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, and we appreciated that he was here on behalf of his Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with the Republican whip that these were productive meetings between Prime Minister Trudeau and members of his cabinet: the finance minister, the ambassador, the foreign minister was there. I think they were productive.

I think our side has made it very clear that we want to get to yes. We believe that the USMCA is an improvement over existing NAFTA, and it also accommodates for changes that have occurred over the last 30 years or so.

We very much want to see, however, that we have enforcement provisions in

the new agreement which apply to workers, their safety, their standard of living, and to the environment, as well as some concerns about pharmaceuticals and biologics.

But we want to get to yes. Our friends in labor want to get to yes. We believe this is an improvement.

I am hopeful we can get enforcement provisions. I know that Speaker PELOSI has made it very clear what we need to get to a yes, and I am hopeful we get there because, personally, I think it will be in the best interest of the country because it is an improvement over the existing NAFTA.

That doesn't mean it is perfect. None of these agreements are perfect. But it was a productive discussion and, hopefully, it will lead to solutions.

Mr. SCALISE. I am equally hopeful we can get that resolved, and I appreciate the gentleman's work on that.

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

□ 1145

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 2019, TO MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GARCIA of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

#### ANGELIC HEALTH HOSPICE CARE

(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, Angelic Health Hospice Care recently cut the ribbon for their new headquarters in Atlantic County, New Jersey.

Their staff provides palliative, hospice, and transitional care services and wound management to patients in south Jersey. Although they have only been operating for a short time, Angelic Health already employs over 200 employees, and they provide great care to over 100 seniors.

What makes Angelic Health special is that they go above and beyond for their patients. They don't make their patients come to their facilities. They go to them, whenever they can, to wherever they can that their patients call home.

They don't only give care for their patients; they also provide professional

support to the families. And they just don't treat physical ailments. Angelic Health gives the patients social, spiritual, and emotional support as well.

I want to thank the staff and the volunteers of Angelic Health who have made our community a more loving place for our seniors and for their families. We are lucky to have them. They have truly impacted lives in south Jersey.

#### HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF JOHN HETLAND AND KOU HER

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

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, this week, my southeast Wisconsin community lost two heroes: Racine Police Officer John Hetland and Milwaukee Police Officer Kou Her.

Officer Hetland, a 24-year veteran of the Racine Police Department, was shot and killed while off duty, trying to stop an armed robbery.

Officer Her, a 2-year veteran of the Milwaukee Police Department, was killed on his way home from a shift as a speeding car crashed into him.

These men are heroes. They will always be remembered for their service.

This is a solemn reminder of the sacrifices members of our law enforcement make every day to protect our communities.

My prayers are with the families and friends of the officers and the entire law enforcement community grieving for these heroes.

#### URBAN GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, while I would love to rise in celebration of the first day of summer, the cold, hard fact is that, as temperatures soar, so does urban gun violence.

During a graduation party last weekend in my district in southwest Philadelphia, a gunman opened fire, claiming one life and injuring five other people.

Last weekend, 23 separate shootings claimed 32 victims and caused five deaths in just 2 days in Philadelphia—23 shootings and five deaths in one weekend.

What is infuriating is that there are proven, commonsense measures that will reduce gun violence in our cities, and the number one strategy is background checks.

115 days have passed since the House sent two bipartisan, commonsense gun safety bills to the Senate. They would have strengthened our background checks. And what has the Senate done? Nothing.

During those 115 days, 11,400 people have died from gun violence in the United States.

Senator MCCONNELL likes to joke about his legislative graveyard, but

countless families are actually burying their loved ones while he does nothing.

The American people deserve better. Our children deserve better.

#### CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RICHMOND, INDIANA, MUNICIPAL BUILDING

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Richmond Municipal Building in Richmond, Indiana.

This week, Richmond has the honor of hosting the Indiana Conference of Mayors, where over 70 hometown leaders from across the State will come together to share ideas on how to better serve Hoosiers in their communities.

The city has so much to be proud of, and this occasion will give them an opportunity to showcase their hard work. From upgrades to Veterans Park to connectivity projects throughout the Depot District, Richmond is an all-American city with a small town charm.

I want to congratulate the president of the Indiana Conference of Mayors, Mayor Dave Snow of Richmond, for his hard work on behalf of all Hoosiers.

#### LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of June as LGBTQ Pride Month.

As we celebrate the contributions of the LGBTQ community, we also know that the fight for full equality under the law is far from over.

I call on Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL to respect the clear majority of Americans who believe that equality must become the law of the land by taking up the Equality Act in the Senate.

We also must do more to ensure that we have the data necessary to enforce key provisions in the Equality Act. That is why I introduced the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, which would help facilitate fair lending to LGBTQ-owned businesses and study the issues affecting them by gathering data from financial institutions about their lending practices toward these businesses.

If we are serious about our country's commitment to civil rights, protecting minorities, and economic opportunity—and, for that matter, about growing our economy—LGBTQ-owned businesses must have access to equal capital.

#### TAKE CARE OF THOSE WHO SERVE

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